
Mr. Archdeacon *CLAGETT's*
Confutation of Mr. WHISTON,
ON THE
Accomplishment of Scripture-
. Prophecies, &c.

I RUTH DO NOT
 REFORM ERROR
 OR A
 VINDICATION
 OF THOSE
 Christian Controversies
 Who have Expounded some
 of the 1121st
 MR. ARTHUR CLAGGETT
 BEING A
 Contention of Part of
 WHISTON
 Proposition: Whether it be
 proved all Duplication of
 OF THE
 To which is Subjoined
 HYPOTHESIS That our
 Heaven several times
 Account of the
 of the
 By

7
 V
 W
 Co
 To
 H
 H
 And
 B
 By
 Tit
 at
 L O
 7
 S

TRUTH Defended, and Bold-
ness in **ERROR** Rebuk'd:

OR, A
VINDICATION

OF THOSE

Christian Commentators,

Who have Expounded some Prophecies
of the **MESSIAS** not to be meant
Only of Him.

BEING A

Confutation of Part of Mr. **WHISTON**'s Book,
Entituled, *The Accomplishment of Scripture-
Prophecies*; Wherein he pretends to Dis-
prove all Duplicity of Sense in Prophecy.

To which is Subjoin'd, an **EXAMINATION** of his
HYPOTHESIS, That our Saviour ascended up into
Heaven several times after his Resurrection.

And in Both there are some Remarks upon other
ESSAYS of the said Author, as likewise in an
Appendix, and a *Postscript*.

With a Large **PREFACE**.

By **NICHOLAS CLAGETT, D.D.**
Archdeacon of **SUDBURY**.

Semper ego auditor tantum? Juven.

Tit. III. 10. *A Man that is an Heretick, after the first
and second Admonition, reject.*

LONDON: Printed for *W. Rogers* at the *Sun*, and
J. Pemberton at the *Buck and Sun*, over-against
St. Dunstan's Church in Fleetstreet. 1710.

TRUTH and Bold
with a ROR

OR A
VINIFICATION

OF THE
Rev. Rector of the Parish of St. John

Who have founded the Hospital
of St. John

Lord Bishop of ELY

43

4

6

060

I have given the All-wise God
to permit and Harely in
the Church the Trial of
Virtue, and even for the Advantage
of the Truth itself. There must be
Hearers for a needful Distinction
amongst



(A 3)

TO THE

Right Reverend Father in God,

JOHN

Lord Bishop of *ELY*.

MY LORD,

IT hath pleased the All-wise God
to permit Error and Heresy in
the Church for the Tryal of
Virtue, and even for the Advantage
of the Truth it self. *There must be*
Heresies, for a needful Distinction
(A 3) amongst

The Epistle Dedicatory.

amongst Men, *that they who are approved may be made manifest*; that the Ingenuous and Honest may be known from others; and that their Impartial Love of the Truth, and Constancy in it, may be Visible to all; since there would not be any Occasion for the Exercise and Illustration of these Virtues, if the Truth were not opposed at all, and if Impostures and False Doctrines were never obtruded.

And as Heresies are suffered in the Church of God, to shew the Difference between the Sincere and Hypocrites, so likewise are they for a farther End; *viz.* That not only the Probity of Good Men, but also the Truth it self might be *made manifest*.

The Dispute about the Necessity of their keeping the Law of Moses, who Believed in Jesus, which some insisted on, ended in an Apostolical Determination of the Point in Question, to the Great Comfort and

The Epistle Dedicatory.

iii

and Joy of the Gentile Converts. And the same Error in some *Judaizing* Christians of Galatia, produced a most Admirable Discourse of St. Paul against it, to the After Settlement of the Truth.

The Attempts made by Seducers in a late Reign, to Eclipse the Light of the Truth in the Reformed Religion of this Church, left it far more Bright and Shining, than it was before. And when of our own selves Men shall arise, *speaking perverse things*, the Truth in the Event proves a Gainer by the Opposition; For that puts us upon renewing our Enquiries, and strictly examining their Objections who *oppose themselves*; and so we come at length to be Confirmed and Established in the Truth upon Better Grounds, than we believed it at the first.

The very Adversaries of the Truth do happen to do it this Service; Even those, who devise New Doctrines
(A 4) that

The Epistle Dedicatory.

that are Repugnant to the Ancient Verities. And thus the Errors and Novelties of a Modern Writer have Occasioned the following Discourse; wherein I have taken some Pains to set Things in the Clearest Light, and to which I have added the Boldness to Inscribe Your Lordship's Great Name.

The chief Subject of a late Piece, to which I have Published this Answer, is Old Testament Prophecy; and some Prophecies of the *Messias* are Intermixed there, but for the most part are treated of in so loose and unedifying a Manner, that I thought my self obliged to endeavour at least to set forth a Better Exposition of those Prophecies; For Prophecy is one very Considerable Testimony to the Truth of Christianity. *The Testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of Prophecy*; It is joined with the Testimony of a Voice from Heaven.

Our

The Epistle Dedicatory.

IV

Our Blessed Lord laid a great Stress upon it immediately after his Resurrection, when one would think there was the least need of such Testimony: For even then he opened the Understanding of his Disciples, that they might understand the Scriptures concerning Himself. Having risen from the Dead, he did not so much insist upon the Great Wonder of the Fact it self, as appeal to the Prophecies of it: And the Prophecies of the *Messias* are those Arguments, which the *Jews* are most ready to hearken to, in order to their Conviction and Conversion, when we enter into Discourse with them. And therefore such Prophecies ought by all Means, to be Interpreted and Explained with more Care and Judgment, than is shewn in a certain Book, which hath lately, with too much Rashness, ventured into the World.

The

The Author nevertheless is apt to fancy, That he himself is only so Happy, as to have hit on the Right Manner of Expounding the Prophecies to Profelyte the *Jews*, as if he was sent before, to prepare the Way of their Conversion: For rejecting the Comments of the Moderns on the Old Prophecies, if he be able, he

p. 29. says, to give a better Account of them, he hopes it may, in some small measure, tend to the Edification of *Christ's Church*, and the bringing both *Jews and Gentiles* into it.

But truly, My Lord, I do think his Explications of Old-Testament Scripture, are no Good Preparations for the Coming in of the *Jews*, or of any other *Infidels*; None of them are likely to be Converted by the Prophecies, after his way of Handling them: And there are divers other very Faulty Things in his Writings, which I have not let go untaken Notice of, and Uncensured.

My

The Epistle Dedicatory.

ivii

My Lord, This Book may seem to bear something hard upon a Person of Note, whom a few Years ago Your Lordship so highly Favour'd and Honour'd, as to take him into Your Family for Sacred Services: And for that Reason, I durst not have crav'd Your Lordship's Patronage of this Work; nor presumed to have sent it into the World under Your Awful Name; had I not been very well assured, that Your Lordship is so Hearty a Lover and Patron of *Truth*, as in Comparison not to regard the Person of Men.

And I was the more loth to suspect any Indecent Presumption in this Humble Address and Dedication to Your Lordship, not only because I was very desirous that what I have written in the Ensuing Tracts, might be Recommended to the World under so Venerable a Protection; but also because

by

by that Means I might Express and Testify the Thankful Sense I have, and shall always have, of my Obligations to Your Lordship.

Indeed there needed no Occasion at all for me to mention Your Lordship's known Excellencies, on the Account whereof the World is so much the Better for You, and Your Great Usefulness for the Common Good ; Your Prudence and Diligence in Transacting Affairs of Moment ; Your Sagacity in Arduous Cases ; Your Compassionate Ministrations to the Diseased and Distressed ; and Your other Beneficial Virtues to Mankind : But however, I thought it became me to take the first Opportunity that presented it self, of making some open Acknowledgments of my own Considerable Share in the Benefits of so Diffusive a Good Will and Charity, and with all possible Gratitude to Own
the

The Epistle Dedicatory.

ix

the Favours You have Conferr'd on
me in particular.

That God would be pleased
long to Preserve Your Lordship,
and continue You still a Publick
Blessing both to Church and State;
a Supporter of the True Religion,
and a Patron of Every Thing that
is Good, and Virtuous, and Praise-
worthy, is the Hearty Desire and
Prayer of,

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's most Obliged,

and most Humble Servant,

NICHOLAS CLAGETT

THE

The Epistle Dedicatory.

the Favours You have Conferred on
me in particular.

That God would be pleased
large to ~~increase~~ Your Lordship,
and continue You still a Publick
Blessing both to Church and State;
a supporter of the True Religion,
and a Rector of Every Thing that
is Good; and Virtuous; and Prais-
worthy; is the hearty Desire and
Prayer of
for the Delay of the Publication
p. My Lord,

Doctrinal Observations
I am, Sir, your most Obedient
Serving Son of Old Testament Pro-
phets. I have been thinking of
the many and great in such manner
recommending that the Younger People should
be superior to the Elder. p. 20. Why
I have quoted the words of a certain
author and the Minister for Apollos
then came to fear and confusion
Why the Children of Israel were
I think

The CONTENTS of the
Preface, and the Book.

Of the PREFACE.

The Occasion of the Work, Page 4.
An Apology for it, p. 73. And
for the Delay of the Publication,
p. 75.

Doctrinal Observations.

Distinct Sorts of Old-Testament Pro-
phesies, Page 13. Why God dis-
tinguished between the Posterities of
Esau and Jacob in such manner, as to de-
termine that the Younger People should
be superior to the Elder, p. 29. Why
St. Paul quoted the Passage out of Mala-
chi, ch. i. ver. 1, 2, 3. concerning the
Edomites and the Israelites, for Applica-
tion of their Case to Jews and Christians,
p. 36. Why the Children of Israel went
down to Egypt, and were at length re-
call'd

The CONTENTS.

call'd from thence, p. 25. Why the *Israelites* were favour'd of God above all other People in the World, p. 24. Why *Judah* was divided from the rest of the Tribes of *Israel*, p. 18. What was the *Epocha* in *Ezek. i. i.* p. 57. That the *Messias* was Typified under the *Mosaical* Dispensation, both by Statutes and Providences, p. 26. *Christ's* Coming Personal and Providential, p. 69.

Mr. Whiston's Errors.

He confounds Prophecy with Immediate Divine Prediction, p. 14. Mistakes the Time when the *Levites* were first separated to the Sacred Service, p. 48. Gives a False Account of the Division of *Judah* from the other Tribes, p. 19. Attributes that Division to the Wickedness of the People, which was a Punishment only of the Wickedness of the Prince, p. 21. Falsely ascribes the same Vision of *Ezekiel* to two different Years of *Jehoiachin's* Captivity, p. 56. Is quite wrong in his Notion of *Christ's* Second Coming, p. 67. Confounds Two Distinct Comings of *Christ*, making them to be one and the same, p. 71.

Other

The CONTENTS.

xiii

*Other things likewise in that Author, very
justly Censured in the Preface.*

He grounds a Discourse of the Scripture-Prophecies at large, on a Text that confin'd him to the Prophecies of the *Messias*, p. 8. Entirely leaves out of his Collection Two very considerable Prophecies, with their Accomplishments, respecting the *Messias*, p. 16. In Prophecies and their Accomplishments manifestly relating to the *Messias*, takes not the least notice of such their Mystical Reference, p. 22. Handles the Prediction concerning the *Edomites* and the *Israelites* but slightly, wholly omitting the Principal Accomplishment of that Prediction, p. 36. Causelessly complains of Disorders and Dislocations in our present Copies of Scripture, p. 46. Particularly in *Ezekiel*, p. 53. Absurdly imagines that the 1st. Verse of that 1st. Chapter, ought to be removed to the beginning of the 30th Chapter, p. 58. And so under Colour of Rectifying a Disorder, would make a most gross one, p. 60. Confidently gives out, That a Third most Glorious Temple shall be built, and that the *Jewish* Sacrifices shall be restored, p. 72.

(a)

The

The Contents of the BOOK.

Points of Doctrine, and Useful Observations.

WHY Balaam in Blessing the *Israelites*, concluded not his Parabolical Benedictions of that People without a Prophecy of *Christ*, p. 23. The first Six Verses of the 2d. *Psalms*, and *Psalms* 118. 22: and 8. 2. and 21. 4, 5, 6. all meant both of *David* and the *Messias*, p. 30, 31, 33, 35. Two Revelations to *David*, That an House should be built for God, with the different Occasions of Both, p. 38. Difference between the Punishment inflicted on *Saul* for his Disobedience, and the Punishment threat'ned to the Seed of *David*, in case they committed Iniquity, p. 40. The Promise that the Throne of *David* should be *established for ever*, respected the *Messias*, Ibid. *Jesus of Nazareth* the last of the Kings of the *Jews*, in the Line from *David*, p. 41. The Promise of a Kingdom *for ever*, not always Absolute, p. 49. The Promise made to *Solomon*, 2 *Sam.* 7. 15. Absolute, 1 *Chron.* 28. 7. Conditional, p. 50. That sometimes * Names were given for

* So *Methuselah*, the Name of *Enoch's* Son, did in its Signification foretell the Approach of the Flood.

The CONTENTS.

xv

Prophecies of Things to come, p. 73. Why *Isaiah* was ordered to take his Son *Shear-jashub* with him, when he was sent to comfort *Abaz* in his Perplexity, p. 75. The Exact Completion of the Promise, *Isa.* 7. 15, 16. in *Maher-sheal-hash-baz*, *Isaiah's* Younger Son, by a second Wife, p. 77. *Isaiah* 7. 24. if but a Single Prophecy, no Prophecy of the *Messias*, p. 79. That the Sign God gave to *Abaz* without his asking it, was a Miracle of the same Nature with any Sign in the depth or in the height, that he was offered to ask, p. 82. How the Promise of a Thing that was not to come to pass till Hundreds of Years after *Abaz's* time, was yet a Sign for his present Comfort and Security, p. 84. The Promise *Isai.* 7. 14. a Double Security to *Abaz*, that *Rezin* and *Pekah* could not destroy the *House of David*, p. 87. *Psalms* 8. 3, 4. Paraphrased, p. 103. Those Words cited by the Apostle from the *Psalmist*, *What is man that thou art mindful of him, &c. Thou hast made him a little lower than the Angels, &c.* not Prophetical of the *Messias*, p. 107. *'Aqov* and *'Ouspuem*, Words of a different Signification, p. 109. How the Narrative of Facts in *Psalms* 78, a Parable, p. 117. And the Moral Instruction of another *Psalms*, how a Parable, p. 118. That *Jeremiah* 31. 15. is

(a 2)

a

The CONTENTS.

a Prophecy that belongs to the Slaughter at *Bethlehem*, more properly than to the *Babylonish* Captivity, p. 125. Why however *Ramah*, and not *Bethlehem*, is mentioned in that Prophecy, *Ibid.* That *Psalms* 41. 9, concerning False *Ahitophel*, was a Prediction likewise of *Judas's* Treachery, p. 127. And *Psalms* 109. 8: concerning *Doeg's* Destruction, was meant also of *Judas's* Fall from the Apostleship, p. 130. That *David* and *Isaiah* were Typical Prophets, speaking some things both of themselves, and in the Person of the *Messias*, p. 131. A Duplicity of Sense in the Original Promise of the *Messias*, p. 132. The *Messias* fore-shewn by all manner of Prophecy, p. 136. Double-Sens'd Prophecy part of that Variety, p. 137. And an addition of Strength to the Testimony of Prophecy, *Ibid.* All Second Completions in the *Messias*, the Primary Accomplishments meant, and in comparison the Prior Accomplishments nothing, p. 149. In Double-Sens'd Prophecies of the *Messias*, respecting others first, and then Him; the first Accomplishments as to Time were but Secondary in Intention, and the second as to Time were Primary in Intention, p. 150. The Doctrine of Type and Figure, and Double Sense, very much in the Writings of the Fathers, p. 182.

Er-

The CONTENTS.

xvii

Errors and Follies of Mr. Whiston Exposed.

His Expounding *Balaam's Prophecy*, Numb.

24. 17. to be a Prediction of *Christ's* Second Coming, and the Resurrection at the Last Day, p. 25. His confounding the Phrases of *Last Days*, *Days of the Messias*, and the *Concluding Age*, with the Phrases of the *Latter End of the World*, *End of the World* and *Last Day*, as if they signified one and the same thing, p. 26. His telling us, That the Great Kingdom of the *Jews* under the *Messias*, commences at the End of the World, p. 28. His spending a great many Pages in an *Appendix*, to maintain a Point no way to the satisfaction of his Readers, p. 37. His taking the whole 7th Chapter of the 2d. Book of *Samuel* to be a Prophecy of the *Messias*, p. 39. The silly Reasons for his Confidence, that 2 *Sam.* 7. 14. is corrupted in our Copies, p. 44. His gross mistaking *Psalms* 89. 26, 27. for a Paraphrase on 2 *Sam.* 7. 14, p. 45. His Misinterpreting *Isaiah* 7. 15, 16. to be meant of *Shear-jashub*, p. 72. And *Israel*, *Hosea* 11. 1. to be the *Messias*, p. 91. And the whole 8th *Psalms* to be a Prophecy of the *Messias*, p. 101. His making the Murther of the Infants by *Herod*, to be an Accomplishment of

(a 3)

Jerem.

Jerem. 31. 15. not as a Prophecy, but only as a *Poetical Description* of that Tragedy, p. 124. His pretending that Double-Senses in Prophecy are Hindrances of the Conversion of the *Jews*, p. 139. Give a Latitude to *Enthusiasts*, p. 146. Are Unnatural, p. 151. No way countenanced and warranted in the Writings of the New-Testament, p. 153. His Impertinent Application of the *Eunuch's* Question to his Hypothesis, as if that made for him at all, p. 158. His venturing so much as to mention *Caia-phas's* Prophecy, which directly makes against him, p. 162. His blaming Expositors for a false Gloss on a Scripture, which he offers not to Expound himself, p. 164. His proving that the *Messias* was Tutelar Guardian of the Children of *Israel*, from Texts which say that *Michael* was their Chief Prince, p. 265.

The CONTENTS.

xix

The CONTENTS of the Animadversions on his *Tracts* about Several Ascensions; and of the *Appendix*.

*Some Observations, and Certain Points
occasionally Handled.*

Distant Things sometimes join'd together in Sacred History for Brevity's sake, p. 199. Sovereignty exercised by our *Lord Christ* in his State of Humiliation, and in farther Degrees after his Resurrection, but most of all after his Ascension, p. 245. Difference between a Dispensation and a Generation, p. 251. Συτέλεια τῷ αἰώνων, *Heb.* 9. 26. and Συτέλεια τῷ αἰῶνι, *Matth.* 13. 39, 40, 49. of different Significations, and what they differently signify, p. 252. That whereas the High-Priest entred into the Holy of Holies on the Day of Expiation at two several times, first with the Blood of a Bullock, and afterwards with the Blood of a Goat, *Christ* entred into the Heavenly Place but once, with but One Blood, (i. e.) his Own, p. 257.

(a 4)

The

The CONTENTS.

The Omnipresence, and Special Presence of God distinguish'd at Large, p. 269. Records amongst the *Jews* besides Scripture-History, *Append.* p. 290. Perpetual Continuance Essential to the Notion of a Scripture, p. 293. A SCRIPTURE defined, p. 294. The Opinion that any Scriptures have been lost, Dangerous, p. 296. The *Israelites* never threat'ned with the Loss of any of the Divine Oracles, for a Punishment of Disobedience, p. 298. The Canon of Scripture so entire at least, as to be abundantly enough for our Instruction, in all Points necessary to Salvation, p. 300.

Errors of Mr. Whiston taken Notice of.

His Perverting St. *Luke's* History, p. 197. And St. *Mark's*, p. 209. His Senseless Inference from *Beza's* Comment on *Mark* 16. 14, p. 211. The Fallshood and Absurdity of his Position, That the Sorrow of *Christ's* Disciples at his Death, was to last till *Christ* had been with the Father, and then their Joy to commence, p. 233. His Ridiculous Criticism on *παθεῖν καὶ ἐπιλθεῖν*, *Luke* 24. 26. for Proof of a Morning Ascension, p. 235. The pernicious Sense he puts on those Words of the Apostle, *ὅτι συντελεία τῶν αἰώνων*, p. 249.

The CONTENTS.

xxi

249. His daring to say, That *Christ*
Suffered and Ascended in the Last Age,
(i. e. Generation) of the World, p. 253.
His confident asserting, That the Sacred
Books of Scripture have been altogether
as much subject to Mistake, Disorder,
and Casualty, as any Human Writings
whatsoever, *Append.* p. 276. And that
all truly Learned Men are of his Mind in
that Particular, p. 280. And that taking
the Bible to be an Entire Collection of
Inspired Writings, without the Loss of
any, hinders a Free Study of the Scri-
ptures, p. 282.

Divers

Divers TEXTS of Scripture
Mr. WHISTON has wrest-
ed from their True Sense, whose
Perversions thereof are manifest-
ly shewn in the Preface and
Book; Viz.

Numbers 24. 17. *I shall see him, but
not now, I shall behold him, but not
nigh; There shall come a Star out of Ja-
cob, &c. Book, Page 25.*

Deuteron. 10. 8. *At that time the Lord
separated the Tribe of Levi to bear the
Ark, &c. Pref. p. 48.*

2 Sam. 7. 10. *Moreover I will appoint
a place for my people Israel, and will place
them, that they shall have a place of their
own, and move no more; neither shall the
children of wickedness afflict them any more
as before time, &c. Book, p. 51.*

Ib. v. 14. *I will be to him a Father, and
he shall be to me a Son, p. 37.*

The CONTENTS.

xxiii

Ib. Verses 18, 19. *Who am I, O Lord God, and what is my House, that thou hast brought me hitherto? And this was yet a small thing in thy sight, O Lord God; but thou hast spoken also of thy Servant's House for a great while to come, p. 48.*

Psalms 89. 26, 27. *He shall cry unto me, Thou art my Father, my God, and the Rock of my Salvation; and I will make him my First-born, &c. p. 45.*

Isaiah 7. 15, 16. *Butter and Honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil and chuse the good: For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, &c. p. 70.*

Ezek. 1. 1. *Now it came to pass in the thirtieth year, in the fourth month, &c. Pref. p. 56.*

Hosea 11. 1. *When Israel was a Child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt, Book, p. 91.*

The First and Second Chapters of Joel, Pref. p. 39.

Mark 16. 19, 20. *So then after the Lord had spoken to them he was received up into Heaven.*

*Heaven, and sat on the right hand of God:
And they went forth, &c. Book, p. 210.*

*Luke 24. 50, 51. And he led them forth as
far as Bethany, and lift up his hands upon
them, and blessed them; and it came to
pass while he blessed them, &c. p. 197.*

*John 16. 16. A little while, and ye shall
not see me, and again a little while, and ye
shall see me, because I go to the Father,
p. 229.*

*Ib. 20. 17. Jesus said unto her, Touch me
not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father,
but go to my Brethren, &c. p. 239.*

*Hebrews 2. 6, 7. But one in a certain place
testified, saying, What is man that thou art
mindful of him, or the son of man that thou
visitest him? Thou madest him a little
lower than the Angels, &c. p. 113.*

*Ib. 9. 26. For then must he have often suf-
fered from the foundation of the World;
But now once in the end of the World hath
he appeared, &c. p. 249.*

*2 Pet. 1. 19. — Until the day dawn, and
the day-star arise in your hearts, Pref.
p. 38.*

The CONTENTS.

xxv

To be added farther.

Two Places of Scripture Mr. *Whiston* attempts to corrupt; viz. 2 *Sam.* 7. 14. and *Pſalm* 72. 1. Book, p. 61. A Third he ſpoils, and would make it Nonſenſe, to evade the True Senſe, that is againſt him, p. 72. A Fourth; viz. A Prophecy cited by St. *Matthew*, he will have to be either falſe Tranſcrib'd in the Old-Teſtament, or elſe to be quite loſt from the Canon there, *Pref.* p. 61. Other Scriptures he has wreſted, which are barely mentioned in this Book, the Error of his Gloſſes thereon not being ſhewn at large; viz. Some of the Scriptures in *Matth.* 24. and the Parallel Places in St. *Mark* and St. *Luke*, *Concluſ.* p. 305. Moſt of the Scriptures, which, he ſays, do relate to the Times after the coming of the *Meſſias*, *Concluſ.* p. 304. All the Scriptures from which he pretends to have proved, That the Apoſtles apprehended the Day of Judgment would come in their Age, *Concluſ.* p. 305. As likewiſe all the Scriptures upon which he grounds the Expectation of a Third Temple, *Pref.* p. 71.

More

More Remarks and Censures.

His Partial Quoting 1 *Chron.* 22, and 28, (i. e.) his not caring honestly to quote from those Two Chapters in express Words, what plainly confutes him, *Book*, p. 55. His Insincerity in the Passage he cites from *Irenæus*, p. 169. His contradicting himself about the Sense of those Words, *Deut.* 10. 8. *At that Time*, Pref. p. 53. And about the Place from whence our Saviour was seen by St. *Paul*, *Book*, p. 264. And about the Time of the Restoration of the *Jews*, Pref. p. 71. His haughty and scornful Treatment of his Betters, *Book*, p. 2. His Indecent Reflection upon the most Learned Christian Divines, p. 3. On the Learned *Beza* in particular, p. 212. His vain and idle Appeal to the *Prophetick Language*, against Modern Commentators, p. 29. His seeming to be Cautious in one Particular, while in other Cases he is very Bold and Venturous, p. 188. The poor things he does with his Use of his *Free Reasoning*, which he claims a Right to as his Privilege, and will not be abridg'd of, p. 71. His Obstinacy in his Scandalous Errors, *Conclus.* p. 307.

ERRATA

The Author has been obliged to leave out several
 names, and to suppress some of the particulars
 of the History, in consequence of the
 great length of the Manuscript, and the
 necessity of abridging it, in order to
 bring it within the compass of a single
 Volume. He has also been obliged to
 suppress some of the names, and to
 suppress some of the particulars, in
 consequence of the great length of the
 Manuscript, and the necessity of
 abridging it, in order to bring it
 within the compass of a single Volume.

The Author has been obliged to leave out
 several names, and to suppress some of
 the particulars of the History, in
 consequence of the great length of the
 Manuscript, and the necessity of
 abridging it, in order to bring it
 within the compass of a single Volume.

THE Impression has happened not to be
 Exact every where, by reason of the
 Author's Distance from the Press; and there-
 fore the following ERRATA he hopes the
 Candid Reader will Excuse, and Correct.

The Author has been obliged to leave out
 several names, and to suppress some of
 the particulars of the History, in
 consequence of the great length of the
 Manuscript, and the necessity of
 abridging it, in order to bring it
 within the compass of a single Volume.

The Author has been obliged to leave out
 several names, and to suppress some of
 the particulars of the History, in
 consequence of the great length of the
 Manuscript, and the necessity of
 abridging it, in order to bring it
 within the compass of a single Volume.

8.
 te
 ess
 m,
 af-
 His
 e of
 me,
 om
 al,
 e of
 71.
 it of
 cent
 Chri-
 Be-
 and
 uage,
 . 29.
 Par-
 very
 poor
 Free
 to as
 'd of,
 alous

 H E

ERRATA.

Preface Page 62. Line 10. leave out against Mischief.
 p. 69. l. 13. no Full Point after for that purpose. Book
 p. 47. l. 12. for but brought read nor brought. p. 49. l. 12.
 leave out neither. p. 76. l. 7. in the Margin, f. *relinquere*
 r. *relinquere*. p. 79. the Parenthesis should end not at Words,
 but at Prophecy. p. 81. l. 4. no Full Point at him, but join
 in that particular, with a Comma after particular. p. 90.
 l. 1. of the Margin, f. *qua* r. *qua*. p. 134. l. 18. f. *were* biff
 r. *was* best. p. 149. l. 5, 6. f. *Secondary Completions* in our
 Lord r. *Completions* in our Lord, but in a *Secondary Sense*.
 p. 181. l. 10. in the Margin, f. *deligitur* r. *diligitur*.
 p. 202. l. 7. r. *Even so St. Luke*. p. 217. l. 1. dele if.
 p. 230. l. 8. f. *Care* r. *Case* of a Woman. p. 236. l. 14.
 for *That* in St. Luke r. *That as* in St. Luke. p. 241. l. 9.
 r. *John* 20. 17. p. 273. l. 22. f. *words* r. *word*. p. 235. l. 11.
 & 13. r. *if the Prediction had been vendred thus*. p. 284. l. 1.
 no Comma at the word *lest*. line 12. f. *are* barely r. *have*
barely. line 25. f. *Father* r. *Father*. p. 287. l. 29. f. *Inspirations*
 or *Inspirations*. p. 288. l. 16. f. *Enlargements* r. *Enlarge-*
ment. p. 289. l. 9. f. *Writings* r. *Writing*. p. 315. r. *Psalms* 78.
 before *Psalms* 78.

In the Greek.

Page 173. line 1. in the Margin, for *περὶ ἐκείνου π* read
περὶ ἐκείνου π. l. 5. f. *ἐπολέμει* r. *ἐπολέμει*. l. 6. f. *μαχη* r.
μαχη. l. 7. f. *τῆς χείρας* r. *τῆς χείρας*. l. 14. f. *αὐτοῦ* r.
αὐτοῦ. p. 174. l. 2. f. *Ἰησὺ* r. *Ἰησὺ*. line 3. f. *οὐκ ἐδόκει* r.
οὐκ ἐδόκει. for *τῇ δουρί* r. *τῇ δουρί*. p. 176. l. 2. f. *ἀκονο-*
μοι r. *ἀκονομοι*. l. 3. f. *δύλω* r. *δύλω*. l. 5. for *ἀκονομοι*
 r. *ἀκονομοι*. l. 9. f. *σώματ* r. *σώματ*. p. 177. l. 1. f.
οὐκ ἐδόκει r. *οὐκ ἐδόκει*. l. 2. f. *περὶ ἐκείνου* r. *περὶ ἐκείνου*.
 l. 8. f. *ἀπερμάτων* r. *ἀπερμάτων*. l. 9. f. *ὕπτων* r. *ὕπτων*. l. 15.
 f. *ἐκείνου* r. *ἐκείνου*. p. 178. l. 5. f. *ἐκείνου* r. *ἐκείνου*. l. 15. f. *ἐκείνου*
 r. *ἐκείνου*. l. 17. f. *περὶ ἐκείνου* r. *περὶ ἐκείνου*. l. 21. f. *ἀν-*
ήνεγκαν, ὁ *Ἀβραάμ* r. *ἀνήνεγκαν* ὁ *Ἀβραάμ*. l. 22. f. *ἀν-*
ήνεγκαν r. *ἀνήνεγκαν*. p. 179. l. 1. f. *ὑπο νόμον* r. *ὑπο νόμον*. l. 3. f.
αἰνέμα ὅτι r. *αἰνέμα* ὅτι. l. 5. f. *παιδαγωγὸν* r. *παιδαγωγὸν*.
 l. 7. f. *τῆς παιδείας* r. *τῆς παιδείας*. l. 9. f. *ῥῆμα* r.
ῥῆμα. f. *ἐδόκει* σοι r. *ἐδόκει* σοι. l. 10. f. *δύο* r. *δύο*. l. 12. f.
ἐχὼ r. *ἐχὼ*. l. 17. f. *ὅς* r. *ὅς*. p. 184. l. 25. f. *διπλαῖ* r. *δι-*
πλαῖ. p. 235. l. 11. f. *ἐμπερνῆσαι* r. *ἐμπερνῆσαι*. p. 236. l. 5. f.
χαρὰν r. *χαρὰν*. l. 9. f. *ὁ πᾶν* r. *ὁ πᾶν*. p. 238. l. 24. f. *τὸ*
πατέρα μὲ r. *τὸν πατέρα* μὲ. So likewise p. 239. l. 3. p. 251.
 l. 1. f. *ὅτι σωτέλεια* ἡ *αἰώνων* r. *ὅτι σωτέλεια* ἡ *αἰώνων*.
 p. 256. l. 8. f. *μῶρον* r. *μῶρον*. p. 291. l. 15. in the Margin
 f. *ἐναγγέλιον* μὲ r. *ἐναγγέλιον* μὲ.

THE PREFACE

To the

READER.

WHEN Mr. *Whiston*, Professor of the Mathematicks in *Cambridge*, preached his first Sermon on *Pet. i. 19.* at Mr. *Boyle's* Lecture, I happened to be one of his Hearers; and truly some of his Doctrine deliver'd in that Discourse, I could not approve: But at that time I intended not in the least to publish my Exceptions; and therefore it may not be amiss to acquaint the Reader with the occasion of my doing it now: And what at length induced me to answer the Professor's Book, which I was far from designing, when I heard him preach the first part of it.

A

The

The P R E F A C E

The Truth of the matter is this : It hath been my Chief Business for some Years, and what I have found a most delightful Study, to *search the Scriptures* of the Old Testament, that I might collect from thence the sundry Preparations for the *Messias*, under the Patriarchal, Mosaical and Prophetical Dispensations, and put together in some Method and Order all the Passages there that relate to the *Messias* ; to the end that we may have them all at one View, and behold at once with Holy Wonder what a vast Number of Types and Prophecies have been accomplished in our Lord *Jesus Christ*. And for a proper Introduction to so Noble a Work, there are some General Observations, which in reading those Ancient Divine Books, I have made ; from whence I think it must be clear and manifest to any one, That *the main End and Aim of most of the Prophecies of the Old Testament, that which the Prophets, or rather that Holy Spirit, which spake by them, had generally in View, when they were delivered, was the Coming of the Messias, and the Circumstances, and Characters of Him, and his Kingdom, as Mr. Whiston notes very well.* And one of my Observations from a View of the Old Testament, which shews that the *Messias* was the Great and Chief Subject of the Prophecies there, is this ; That the Spirit of Prophecy seems to have broken forth

concerning Him upon all fitting and congruous Occasions ; insomuch, that He is often mixed with other things, where he can any way fairly be brought in ; and sometimes, after a Subject is begun that is Foreign to Him, there are Digressions from the Subject diverting into Him. And it is one of Mr. *Whiston's* Observations concerning the Prophetick Stile, That *it is not always entire, continued, and coherent through one Series of Reasoning ; but is sometimes short, abrupt, and disturbed by the coming on of other Matters of a very different Nature.* And thus far, I think, Mr. *Whiston* and I may be agreed. But this is not all : There is another thing true, and which I chiefly observe under this Head, and that is, That there are not only direct Prophecies of the *Messias*, where He is the sole and single Subject, but also Prophecies of Him of quite another Nature ; to wit, Prophecies of Him that have a double Sense ; where He, and another or others are meant, and spoken of, and are joined together, and referred to in the very same Prophetical Terms and Expressions : For it is one thing for a Prophecy of the *Messias*, that is meant only of Him, to be interwoven with other Subjects, and another thing for both Him and others to be Subjects of one and the same Prophecy.

Now most evident it is, that in several

Prophecies, where single Persons are spoken of, the *Messias* also was intended to be the Subject ; and likewise I will clearly shew, that in one Prophecy the *Messias* is meant, where a whole Nation or People, in another, where all Mankind is the Prophet's Subject.

And this Observation, which amongst other Arguments doth prove that the *Messias* was the main and chief Subject of the Oracles before His Appearing, and that the Old Testament runs into *Jesus*, I had but newly dwelt upon, and with no little Satisfaction and Delight ; When, Behold ! the Pleasure of that Meditation, met with a very surprizing Check from Mr. *Whiston's* first Sermon at Mr. *Boyle's* Lecture in St. Paul's Cathedral, where I happened to be present at his Preaching of it : For therein he was pleased to tell his Audience, That *the Style and Language of the Prophets is always singular and determinate : That the double Sense and Interpretation of the Ancient Prophecies, is absurd in itself, and pernicious to the Scripture Proofs of our Christian Faith ; and here we lose all the Real Advantage of the Ancient Prophecies, as to the Proof of our Community with Christianity ; and That this has laid a great Obstacle and Stumbling-Block in the way of Reasoning upon the Prophetick Writings ;* as he says, he may add, in the way of the Christian Version of the Jews also. That the Christian

to the *R E A D E R.*

IV

an Interpreters of the Prophecies have strangely erred in their Comments, having put double Senses upon Prophecies of the *Messias*; and are much to blame for such their *poor and unsatisfactory Interpretations*, which are to be attributed to their *Unskilfulness in the Prophetick Language and Dialect*: Nay, That if we interpret any Prophecies of the *Messias* this way, we *expose our selves to the Insults of Jews and Infidels in our Discourses with them, and our Holy Religion to their Laughter*. This coming from Mr. *Whiston*, amazed me not a little, and the more, because I thought my self in a great measure Master of his Subject, and believed that, perhaps, I was versed in the Prophetick Writings, and in the *Noble and Divine Dialect* he speaks of, no less than himself; even tho' I was never encouraged to that particular sort of Study by such a Call thereto, as brought him to the Pulpit of *St. Paul's*. When therefore I saw, that he was minded to disturb and unsettle a constant Doctrine of Expositors, and that he went about to destroy a Notion of Prophecy, which, as I thought, I had thoroughly considered, and well digested just at that time; and when I discerned, that in maintaining his Paradox, he went on with more Air of Self-conceit, than Strength of Argument, and that in what he delivered, he discovered an Affectation of Novelty, rather

P. 12.

p. 16.

P. 20.

ther than a Love of the Truth ; I remember, I could not forbear turning my Back with some Concern and Indignation, being grieved to hear such Stuff from a Man of Sense and Learning, from whom I justly expected better things. Neither could I satisfy my self, and be at ease after hearing his Sermon, till I had come to a Resolution to endeavour the convincing him of his Error, by sending him some Sheets for that purpose. Indeed a Learned Friend, to whom I imparted my Design, advised me to forbear, till he had finished his Discourse on 2 *Pet.* i. 19. that is, till he had preached his Eight Sermons, and printed the whole Set ; but I thought, it would be kind rather to stop him from proceeding any farther in the Wrong, and to prevent his exposing himself by the Publication of his Mistakes, if I could : So then, as soon as I could get time, I fell to work, and when I had prepared and finished what I intended, I sent him a very large Letter, supposing that it might occasion the passing of some Papers between us touching the Point in Controversy : But I received not one Title from him, no not so much as a Line of Thanks for all my Pains : And when I employed a Friend to expostulate the Case with him, and to learn his Reason, why he was not pleased to take the least Notice of what I had done ; It seems he excused his strange

Silence by appealing to his Book; that should soon be published, as what would be answer sufficient to my Sheets, and give me Satisfaction: And at length out comes his Book, for which I waited with the more Impatience, because I perceived I was like to have no Answer from him, but what I should find there. And his Book I have read over and over again, and with the closer Attention and Application, because he referred me to it; for which reason I may well suppose, it is a Piece much admired by himself: But I am apt to think, that upon a stricter Review of the Performance, which I shall occasion him to make, he will begin to fall somewhat in his Opinion of it: Nor will he be pleased with himself upon Second Thoughts, that he would answer my Letter no other ways than by sending me to his Book; for having examined his Book, several things I find there, which I cannot but dislike: And therefore before I come to my particular Business, which is to consider that part of his Book where he pretends to prove, That there are no double-sensed Prophecies of the *Messias*, I shall enlarge my Preface with some Reflections on the rest of his Book, and shall give my Judgment of the Whole.

When I first saw in one of the Printed Papers, which gave Notice of the Publica-

tion of his Book, that it came forth with this Title, *The Accomplishment of Scripture-Prophecies*, it seemed to me but an imperfect sort of Title for the Subject he was to treat of: I expected the Title of his Book should rather have been this, *The Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies of the Messias in Jesus Christ*. But when I came to read his Book, I soon found, that it agreed with his Title better than I could have thought: For truly in a great Part of his Book he quite departs from his Text, and deserts that particular Subject, which his Text required him to handle from it at *Mr. Boyle's Lecture*; not confining himself to Scripture-Prophecies, that relate to the *Messias*, but treating at large of Scripture-Prophecies and their Accomplishments in the general, and those Old Testament Predictions, that were fulfilled in Old Testament Days, and were to be fulfilled no farther, he puts together with Old Testament Predictions, that were not fulfilled till the Days of the *Messias*; as if they were equally his Subject. And his grounding such a sort of Discourse on his Text, which is too narrow for it, he calls *confining himself* to Prophecies of the *Messias* in somewhat larger Notion, than he at first mentioned. This I thought Strange, when I first cast my Eye upon his Book, because it is plain that his Text led him to speak of no Scripture-Prophecies, but what belong to the *Messias*.

Messias. He begins his Discourse with observing, That in his Text St. Peter *appeals in general to the sure Word of Prophecy, or to the Ancient Predictions of the Jewish Prophets, and their remarkable Completion in Christ Jesus, as a most uncontested Evidence for the Truth of his Religion.* Therefore, one would think, he should have made the Prophecies of the *Messias* his sole Subject, and not have mingled therewith Prophecies and Accomplishments, that have no Relation to the *Messias* at all. For were the Divine Threatnings of the Universal Deluge, and of the Destruction of *Sodom* and *Gomorrab*, and of the Excision of *Eli's* House from the High Priesthood, and the Curse of the Rebuilder of *Jericho*, and the like, Predictions of the *Messias*? Or was the *Messias* concerned in such Predictions any farther, than as their Accomplishments being contained in the Sacred Writings, do, amongst other Arguments, demonstrate the Divine Authority of the Old Testament, which confirms the Authority of the New? And were Predictions of this Sort the *sure Word of Prophecy* meant, *whereunto* we should do well that we take heed? One of his Observations preparatory to his Scripture-Prophesies, and a very good one as I have owned, is, That *the main End and Aim of most of the Prophecies of the Old Testament, that which the Prophets, or rather that Holy Spirit,* which

which spake by them had generally in view, when they were delivered, was the Coming of the Messias, and the Circumstances, and Characters of him, and his Kingdom; And if that be true, there was less need of his handling in his Treatise those Scripture-Prophecies, in which there was no aim at the Messias; especially since the Prophecies of the Messias, without the other, had been abundantly sufficient for the propounded Quantity of Discourse, and to make his Book of a just Bulk. And therefore he is the more to blame, that he hath wandred so much from his Text; forasmuch as his Subject was very Large and Copious, had he kept never so close to his Text. For if he had insisted only on the Prophecies which were his proper Subject, and duly enforced the Argument from thence for the Confirmation of Believers, and the Conversion of Infidels, as he ought to have done; if he had rescued, and delivered the Prophecies of the Messias from the Cavils, Evasions, and Perversions of the Jews, whereby they would hinder the Application of those Prophecies to Jesus; if he had thus cleared the Testimony of Prophecy, that the sure Word of Prophecy might appear indeed equal, if not preferable to the Testimony of that Voice from Heaven, which St. Peter had been an Ear-Witness of, and which he had laid so great Strefs on; here had been Matter, I will not say for Eight

or Sixteen Sermons, but for a very great Volume, without taking in any Prophecies foreign to the *Messias*, to fill up withal; and this had been a Piece of Service to our most Holy Religion, for which the Church of Christ would have thanked him. Surely it must somewhat grieve him all his Days, whenever he duly thinks of it, That he hath slipt so fair an Opportunity of illustrating the Prophecies of the *Messias*, and shewing their Completion in *Jesus*, as his Text, and the Excellent Man's Lecture gave him. For my Part, when I was informed of the Subject he had chosen for Mr. *Boyle's* Lecture, I forbore to proceed on that Part of my intended Tract, which is to contain the Preparations for the *Messias* under the Prophetical Dispensation; and for that very Reason laid it aside for the Present, because I hoped for a considerable Help from him, in order to make that Work the more Compleat, and Perfect: But as soon as I came to look into his Book, I found my Expectation disappointed.

And yet I would by no means seem to say all the while, that his Eight Sermons are of no Use, though they were not Preached properly from 2 *Pet.* i. 19. It is certain he had pitched upon a far nobler Subject of Discourse, had he confined himself to that only, which his Text contains, and he had done much better; but yet take
his

his Treatise, as it is, I freely own there was a good Design in it; *viz.* in his collecting the Scripture-Prophecies and their Accomplishments; that being viewed and considered together, they might increase our Esteem and Veneration of *those Sacred Writings, which have all along contained the Predictions of Future Events, no way within the Reach of Natural Foresight*; and convince Atheists and Deists, That Holy Scripture was given by Divine Inspiration. But I like the Design of his Book far better than his way of managing the Subject of it. Indeed some of the Prophecies in his Book he has explained, and cleared, and shewed the Accomplishment of well enough; but in treating on others of them he has not *acquitted himself with Care and Judgment, or with Perspicuity and Evidence.* And then in his Discourse of the Prophecies, I meet with some Passages here and there, which are liable to Exception and Censure, and do not become *sound Doctrine*, besides the particular Error chiefly contained in his First Sermon; and therefore I could not forbear an Animadversion upon his Book at large.

I have observed, That his Scripture Prophecies, which are not placed by him in the best Order and Method, are of *two Sorts, viz.* Those which were accomplished before the Coming of the *Messiah* and

The
ture-P
and Ex
mised
Predic

and those which were to be accomplished in him. As likewise, Those Prophecies, which were accomplished in the Days of Old before Christ, are of Two Sorts, Those Prophecies and their Accomplishments, in which there was an Eye to the *Messias*, and he was the Reason and Intent of both; and Those which purely related to the Times, when the Matters foretold were fulfilled, and in which the *Messias* was not in the least intended. Of which Predictions some were fulfilled sooner, but most of them at a vast Distance from their Date. Now Mr. *Whiston* takes no Notice of these Distinctions, but only reckons up the Scripture Prophecies and their Accomplishments in order of Time (for that was his general Rule) without any farther Difference; and his great Design was to give a perfect Recital of the several particular Prophecies occurring in the Sacred Writings, as they were delivered from Time to Time, and of their Accomplishments one after another in their Season: Whereas, I think it had been better, if he had distributed the Prophecies into their different Sorts, and so had reduced them distinctly to their proper Heads.

There is also in his Book of the Scripture-Prophecies, another thing not so Right and Exact, which is fit likewise to be premised before I examine his handling the Predictions themselves; and that is, I observe,

serve, That he confounds Prophecy with immediate Prediction from God himself, and makes them the same; things which I ever took to be distinct in Scripture. Thus

p. 82. 94. for Instance, God's immediate Declarations
 108. 113. of Future Events to the Serpent, and to
 118. 129. *Noah*, and to *Abraham*, and to *Rebecca*, he
 139. 146. calls *Prophecies*, as well as the Predictions
 of the Prophets. This is not like an Ac-
 curate Writer: For Prophecy is never attri-
 buted immediately to God; no, nor to the
 Angels neither, but only to Inspired Men.
 Every Scripture-Prophecy of Things to
 come, is a Divine Prediction, but every
 Divine Prediction is not a Prophecy in the
 Stile of Scripture; to wit, not any such
 Divine Prediction as came immediately
 from God. Mr. *Whiston* in one Part of his
 Book is pleased to disparage the Modern
 Expositors of Scripture, as unskilful in the
 Scriptural Dialect; And who so great a
 Master of the Sacred Dialect, as Mr. *Whi-*
ston? But I am sure, that he discovers
 Want of Skill in that Stile; and shews
 that he is one, that is not much used to it,
 who calls Immediate Divine Predictions,
 Prophecies. For where in Scripture is God
 himself said to be a Prophet, or to prophe-
 cy, or to give forth, or deliver a Pro-
 phesy? Let Mr. *Whiston* shew me, if he
 can. God Almighty raises up, and sends
 Prophets; His Word comes to his Prophets;

He

He speaks *by the Mouth of his Holy Prophets*; He pours his Spirit upon his Prophets; He is *the Lord God of the Holy Prophets*; But himself, when his own Divine Nature only is spoken of, is not once stiled a Prophet in all the Bible. One of the

good Things in Mr. *Whiston's* Book, upon the Account whereof he tells us, it is Useful, and will be of Benefit to the World is this; That it demonstrates the

In the 14th Page of his Book he speaks of *Prophetical Predictions*; in which Place therefore, he seems to own the Distinction, to wit, That there are Predictions, which in the Scriptural Stile are not properly *Prophetical*.

Certainty of the Spirit of Prophecy from the P. 6.

Beginning of the World; but if by the *Spirit of Prophecy* he means, as sometimes he does,

not the Spirit of God in his Inspired Prophets, when he made use of Men to speak

by them; but the Divine, Prescient, and Omniscent Spirit it self, without any Regard

to Inspiration of Men thereby: Then it is most certain, that without any need of De-

monstration from his Book, there was a Spirit of Prophecy, not only from the Be-

ginning of the World, but from all Eternity. But neither shall I lay any Stress upon

this Distinction: Let it be supposed for instance, that what the Holy Ghost spake im-

mediately himself was Prophecy, as properly in the Scriptural Notion of the

thing, as what Holy Men of Old spake being moved by the Holy Ghost. I have

more Cause to dislike some Things, which I find

I find amiss in his Manner of treating on the Scripture-Predictions themselves: For some Eminent Prophecies, which had a special Reference to the *Messias* with their Completions, he hath quite left out of his List. Others that manifestly relate to the *Messias* he hath handled largely; but is wholly silent about such their Mystical Reference, observing nothing of that sort in them. * I find his Collection is defective; and so

* I might add in the 3d Place, That on the contrary hand, other Scriptures he makes Prophecies of the *Messias*, of which we have reason to doubt, whether they were ever intended for such Prophecies; at least we cannot be certain that the *Messias* was meant in them: For so he interprets *Hannah's Song*, p. 235. and *David's last Words*, p. 272. 1 Sam. 2. 9, 10. 2 Sam. 23. 1, 3. his 20th, and 23^d Prophecies. There are enow plain and undoubted Prophecies of the *Messias* in the Old Testament; and therefore there is little need of insisting upon any other Places there as Prophecies of him, which carry no clear Evidence of their belonging to him.

he hath failed in the very Thing he propounded, which was an entire Enumeration of the Scripture-Prophecies with their Accomplishments in Order of Time; and he hath done but imperfectly in his own way: For in his *Accomplishment of Scripture-Prophecies* he hath not mentioned *Samuel's Prophecy* to King *Saul*, That God would rend the Kingdom of *Israel* from him, and give it to his Neighbour of his that was

better than he, even to a Man after God's own Heart; which was fulfilled accordingly. Nor have we one Syllable from him of *Abijah's Prophecy* to *Jeroboam*, when they were alone in the Field, That God

1 Sam. 13.
14, 15, 28.

would

would give him Ten Tribes of *Israel*, and leave only one to *Solomon's* Son; which was likewise fulfilled. How he came to overlook these Two Prophecies, himself best knows. He cannot say they were any of those *later Prophecies*, which he should treat of in the Series of his future Discourses, because he passed these Two Prophecies over, and went beyond them, even as far as *Nathan's* Prophecy to *David* in the Appendix, 2 Sam. 7. and *David's* last Words, 2 Sam. 23. But it is certain, that these Prophecies and their Accomplishments referred to the *Messias* in an especial manner; and for that Reason could not well be spared out of the Collection: For the *Messias* was to spring out of *Judah*; on which Account a very particular Respect was all along paid to that Tribe. Thus for Instance, After the legal Government was constituted in *Israel*, the Seat of the Kingdom was translated from *Benjamin* to *Judah* in the very Second reign: The Second Monarch of *Israel* was of that Tribe. And moreover the Tribe of *Judah* was at length kept separate from all the other Tribes of *Israel*, except *Benjamin*, which it included: For the Tribe of *Benjamin*, which had the Seat of Judgment, and the Royal Family first, ever adhered to that Tribe, which had it next. Thus as *David* reigned over *Judah* only, before he was made King over all *Israel*;

1 Kings
11. 29, 30,
31.

p. 205.

p. 247.
272.

so in his Grandson's Time the Monarchy of *Israel* ceased in his Family ; and *Rehoboam* was King of *Judah* only, as *David* was at first. That Tribe was mingled with the other Tribes under the Government of the same Monarch no longer than during the Three first Reigns ; in the Fourth it was divided from the rest of the Tribes, who got a King of their own ; and ever after was the great Distinction between the House of *Israel*, and the House of *Judah*. Now though indeed it was *Saul's* Disobedience that occasioned the Removal of the Royal Sceptre from his Family in *Benjamin* to another Tribe ; and though again *Solomon's* Idolatry, and his Son *Rehoboam's* Folly were justly punished with the Revolt of the Ten Tribes from the House of *David* ; yet I would have it observed, that in these remarkable Dispensations of Providence there was a Divine Meaning, and a deep Mystery with respect to the *Messias* ; that is to say, The House of *Saul* being laid aside, *David* was advanced to the Throne of *Israel*, that the *Messias* thenceforth might descend of the Royal Line in his Family. And then, so much as *Judah* was superior to all the other Tribes, because thence came the *Chosen Ruler* ; therefore it was not long before the Tribe was broken off from the other, to be numbred by it self, as a Tribe of the Chief Note. And such a Distinction

1 Chron.
5. 2.

Jud

Judah from the rest of *Israel* was highly fit and requisite, because it was to be the lasting Tribe, that should hold on, and subsist for several Ages and Generations, after the Dissolution and Dispersion of the other Tribes: For *the Sceptre* was not to depart from *Judah*, till *Shiloh* came. * And therefore seeing *Samuel's* and *Abijah's* Predicti-

* This is a far better Account of the Separation of *Judah* from the other Tribes than what Mr. *Whiston* hath given, where he happens to speak of it; whose strange Remark thereupon is this; That the Divine Meaning in that Division, was to make *Israel* and *Judah* perpetual Plagues to one another. For he says, That by so Fatal a Division of the Nation, God laid a Foundation for many sore Wars and Calamities all along afterwards, intending it for a sad Judgment both upon *Israel* and *Judah*, as it would engage the Princes of both in Immortal Quarrels about Titles, p. 204, 205. That is Marvellous: How could Mr. *Whiston* say, That by the Providence of that Division, God laid a Foundation for many sore Wars afterwards, when as immediately after the Division was made, God took Care, once for all, expressly to inhibit all War and Bloody Disputes on that Score, declaring that the thing was from him; and therefore He forced *Rehoboam* to fight against the Revolted Tribes for the reducing of them. And since *Rehoboam*, in whose Time the Rent from the House of *David* was first made, did in obedience to the Divine Message by *Sheraiah*, desist from the intended Expedition against *Jeroboam*; it was not like that any of *Rehoboam's* Successors should renew the quarrel upon Claim of Right to the Ten Tribes; I say, it seems a groundless Assertion of Mr. *Whiston's*. That God by dividing *Judah* from *Israel*, laid a Foundation for many sore Wars and Calamities afterwards; or intended any such thing, making two Kingdoms of one; Whereas he began the Division, not without a special Precaution, that there should be no War on that Pretence, because the thing was from Him. Nor do we read, that in the Event there was War between the Princes of *Israel* and *Judah* any longer than in the Three first Reigns after the Rent was made;

ons with their Completions, now mentioned, were both of them Prophecies and Accomplishments that so notably related to the *Messias*, and pointed at him, in as much as the Honourable Distinction and Separation of that Tribe, out of which he was to come, was Mystically intended by the latter; and his Descent from the Royal Family in that Tribe by the former. I think Mr. *Whiston*, in his Book of Scripture-Prophecies, might better have left out several other of them, which he hath set down, than he could these Two; and the Omission is the less to be excused. Indeed in his 15th general Prophecy, which contains God's threatening

to wit, between *Rehoboam* and *Jeroboam*, 1 Kings 14. 30. & 15. 6. and between *Abijam* and *Jeroboam*, 1 Kings 15. 7. and between *Asa* and *Baasha*, 1 Kings 15. 32. excepting the War afterwards between *Jehoash* and *Amaziah*, 2 Kings 13. 12. & 14. 11. 12. And sometimes the Princes of the Two Kingdoms were dear Friends and Allies. So were *Ahab* and *Jehoshaphat*, 1 Kings 22. 4. and *Jehoram* and *Jehoshaphat*, 2 Kings 3. 7. and *Joram* and *Ahaziah*, 2 Kings 9. 16. 23. 27. And when any of the two Princes happened to engage in War with one another, they did it not about Titles to each other's Dominions; as is evident from hence, That tho' *Rehoboam* obeyed the Divine Command not to fight against the Children of *Israel*, to bring again the Ten Tribes to him; yet it is said notwithstanding That there was War between *Rehoboam* and *Jeroboam* all their Days, 1 Kings 14. 30. & 15. 6. Wherefore it could not well be supposed, that the War between them all their Days was grounded on a Claim of Right to the Crown of *Israel* on the King of *Judah's* side; but there were other Reasons of Difference between them, which ordinarily occasion Nations and Kingdoms to quarrel with one another.

th

the *Israelites* with Judgments, if they *should* at any time prove *Disobedient* to his Laws; and God's inflicting them upon the *Israelites*, when disobedient, he tells us of *Saul's* Punishment for his Disobedience, and of *Solomon's* for his Idolatry; but when he speaks of *Saul's* Rejection, he mentions not at all *Samuel's* repeated Prophecy of it; and when it came into his Mind to quote God's Threatning to *Solomon* in more general Terms, to wit, that he would punish his Idolatry with rending the Kingdom from him, and giving it to his Servant; he took no Notice withal of *Abijah's* particular and expresse Prophecy to *Jeroboam* in private about it: Whereas these were Prophecies, which I will say, deserved a particular and distinct Consideration, as well as any of the Three and Twenty we have in his Book.†

† It is something odd, that in his Prophecy concerning God's Threatning the *Israelites* in case of Disobedience, and his Punishing them for it from Time to Time, he should bring in *Saul's* and *Solomon's* Rejection under that Head, which were Punishments not of the People's Disobedience, but purely of the Personal Faults of those two Princes. So he makes God's Rending the Kingdom from *Solomon*, which was the Punishment of his Idolatry, to be the Punishment of a wicked Nation. For he says, God set up *Jeroboam* the Son of *Nebat* over ten of the Tribes of *Israel*, leaving only two Tribes to the Posterity of *Solomon*, as a sad Judgment on a wicked Nation, p. 204. And why a wicked Nation at that time? I pray, What particular Wickedness in the *Israelites* was it, that God punished in this kind, and for which the Division was a sad Judgment upon them? They had been a Religious Nation, they had served the Lord all the Days of Pious *David*; and at least in most of *Solomon's* Reign.

And yet this is not all the Fault I find with his Collection of Scripture-Prophecies and their Accomplishments: He hath not only omitted, as I have shewn, very significant ones, on the Account of the *Messias*, but there are some Predictions and Completions of the like important Signification, which he hath numbred in his Book amongst the rest, and been large upon, without taking the least Notice of their Reference to the *Messias*, or that the *Messias* was mystically meant in them.

p. 108.

Of this kind are his 5th, and his 15th Prophecies; viz. *That Abraham's Posterity should be exceedingly multiplied above that of other Nations, especially so long as it should preserve the Worship and Service of the True God, and keep it self free from the Idolatry and Wickedness of the Neighbouring Countries; and the Promises that were made to the Children of Israel, of Temporal Happiness in the Land of Canaan, while they should be obedient to the Laws given 'em by Moses; and the Threats of Temporal Misery, if they should at any time prove disobedient to the same.* Which therefore by the way are not Two distinct Prophecies, as he makes them;

p. 185.

Reign. Nay, we do not read that *Solomon's Apostacy* in his old Age occasion'd *Israel* to Sin by drawing the Nation to the like Idolatry.

but

but coincident and the same, that is, if in his 5th Prophecy, we *confine our selves to the Posterity of Jacob alone*, as he would have us to do. Now there, and in his 15th Prophecy he tells us, *That there was a peculiar Providence and Blessing over the Nation of Israel from the eldest Times of it, particularly as to the fulfilling of the Prophecies concerning them; and such an one as is unexampled among all the Rest of the Nations of the World.* That God did at first most plainly and frequently promise and foretell, *That he would always take this Nation under his especial Care; That they should be the Portion of the great Messias, and his Lot and Possession in a peculiar Manner; That in Jury was God* p. 110.
most certainly known, and his Name was most justly great in Israel; That this single Nation was particularly under a Theocracy; and, That this was a most illustrious Instance of the Veracity of God, and of the Certainty of the Prophetick Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. p. 112.
All which is very true; but he says nothing of the Reason, why the Children of Israel were in this manner the Elect of God, to whom the Divine Promises were made at first; and in whom they were fulfilled in the succeeding Ages of the World; which was, *They were the People that were honoured with the Descent of the Messias from them: There was this in God's singular Favour to that People above all the Nations* p. 183.
of p. 186.

P. 188.

Jer. 31. 3.

Malac. 3.
6.Gen. 12.
2, 3.

of the World. And therefore whereas he speaks of it as *an amazing Difference in the Conduct of the Almighty*; as if God's Concern for that People were *strange*, I think truly the thing would not have appeared to him so *Strange and Amazing*, if he had thought of the *Messias*; since the *Israelites* were the *Favourite People*, selected out of the World; because out of them, *as concerning the Flesh*, Christ was to come, *who is over all, God Blessed for ever*. For upon that Account it was, that God was pleased to express so constant an Affection to the Tribe of *Judab*, *I have loved thee with an Everlasting Love*; therefore *with loving-Kindness have I drawn thee*. Likewise God speaks thus to the *Israelites* of the same Tribe, *I am the Lord, I change not*; therefore ye *Sons of Jacob* are not consumed; that is, Though they, as well as their Brethren of the other Tribes, had provoked him to Anger by their Sins, yet he would not dissolve and destroy that Tribe as yet; because he had immutably determined, that the *Messias* should come of it while the *Jewish Government* was yet standing, according to *Jacob's Prophecy*, Gen. 49. 10. The Two distinct Promises to *Abraham*, That God would make of him a great Nation, and That in him *all Families of the Earth* should be blessed, were made to *Abraham* both together at the same time. As likewise Mr. *Whiston* puts them together

in his Collection, being his 5th and his 6th p. 108.
113.
 Prophecies. Methinks then it was very natural to have observed, that the former Promise was grounded upon the latter; that is, That therefore God promised that *Abraham's Posterity should be exceedingly multiplied above that of other Nations*; because he promised withal, *That in the Seed of Abraham all the Nations of the World should in an extraordinary Manner be blessed; or that God would raise up a wonderful Person from his Offspring, to be a mighty and common Blessing to the whole Race of Mankind through all the World.*

Another Prediction of the same Sort he is large upon, without observing or assigning the Mystical Reason of it, and its Accomplishment, is his 9th Prophecy, viz. That p. 129.
 the Children of *Israel* were to descend into *Egypt*; and in the Fourth Generation, at the End of Four Hundred Years, to return again. For in this remarkable Providence was there no Regard to another distant Event of infinitely greater Importance? no Eye to a certain Passage of the *Messias*, soon after he should be born into the World? I affirm there was. For it was the very End and Design of that signal Act of Providence, God's sending the Children of *Israel* into *Egypt*, and calling them again from thence in their Childhood, when they were first a People, to figure thereby a far greater

Deut. 9.
6.

er Providence at a Distance; to wit, God's sending his Son *Jefus* thither in his Infancy, and recalling him thence, though in a much shorter Time. The latter Providence, I say, was meant in the former; and the one was intended to be a Mystical Presignification of the other. It is to be observed, That as the Children of *Israel* were, as I have said, the peculiar chosen People of God above all other People; not at all upon the Account of any real singular Worth in them, or for their *Righteousness*; for they were a *Stiff-necked* People; but because that Christ was to be born of them: So such were the Dealings of God with that People, that under the *Mosaical* Dispensation, Regard was had to the *Messias* both in Institutions and Facts; that is, in divers Statutes and Ordinances God gave to that People, and in sundry Providences towards them. As to the First; A great Part of the Ritual Law of *Moses* was Typical of Christ, and given on Purpose with respect to him. And in the Days of the *Israelites* the *Messias* was not less typified by several Providences towards that People. As for Instance, By the Manna they were fed with from Heaven, as our Saviour applies it, *John 6*. By the Water out of the hard Rock, as *St. Paul* applies that Case, *1 Cor. 10*. Where the Apostle calls the Manna *Spiritual Meat*, and the Water out of the Rock *Spiritual Drink*; and the Rock

self *Christ*. By the Brazen Serpent in the Wilderness; as our Saviour applies that Miraculous Medicine for curing the Bitten by Serpents, *John* 3. 14. 15. By the Passage of the *Israelites* through the Red Sea under a Cloud; and between Two Walls of Water, as *St. Paul* applies it, *1 Cor.* 10. and likewise our Church in her Office for Baptism: And so by the Deliverance of the *Israelites* from *Egypt*; as *Hosea* and *St. Matthew* do apply that Event, *Hosea* 11. 1. *Mat.* 2. 15. And tho' there are these several Applications of Ancient Providences to the Times of the *Messias*; yet, Forsooth, the Doctrine of Figure, and Type, and Mystery will not go down with *Mr. Whiston*: He utterly dislikes *Double Senses*, and *Typical Interpretations*, as Things, he says, *never to be proved by Christians*; and he cannot allow one Person or Thing to be a Type of another. p. 20.
p. 26.

But I shall instance chiefly in his Eleventh Prophecy, as having Mystery in it with respect to the *Messias*, which he is pleased to speak nothing to; viz. his Prophecy concerning the Posterity of Jacob, That it should be more powerful than the Posterity of Esau; and concerning the Posterity of Esau the elder Brother, That it should serve the Posterity of Jacob the younger Brother; which we have in the 25th Chapter of *Genesis*; where we find, That when *Rebekah's Children* struggled p. 146.

gled together within her, and she went to enquire of the Lord about it, the Lord explained the Matter to her in this Prediction concerning her Twins, *Two Nations are in thy womb, and two manner of People shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one People shall be stronger than the other People, and the elder shall serve the younger.* And the very same thing which God himself foretold concerning the *Edomites* and *Israelites* before their Progenitors were born, inspired *Isaac* prophesied concerning the Posterity of his two Sons *Esau* and *Jacob*, when they were both of them born, and Men grown, the Apostle to the *Hebrews* notes: For he says *By Faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau concerning things to come.* And now doubtless something very considerable must be meant by this early a Divine Determination concerning *Esau's* and *Jacob's* Seed, That the *Elder* House should serve the *Younger*; this being Decreed and Declared, whilst the Fathers of those two Nations were as yet unborn. For why did God distinguish betwixt the Children of *Esau* and *Jacob* after so strange a manner, as to make the Posterity of the *Younger* the Superior People? Are we to think that God lightly made this Difference without some secret Meaning and Reason in his Wisdom? No certainly: But this was a great Mystery, to use *St. Paul's* Words in another Case: For in truth the *Edomites*

Gen. 25.
22, 23.

Gen. 27.
28, 29.

Heb. 11.
20.

and *Israelites* in the Letter were no other than the *Jewish* and the *Christian* Church in the Mystery : That is, God Almighty by giving forth, that thus it should go with the Two Nations in *Rebekah's* Womb, viz. That the one People should be stronger than the other People, and the Elder serve the Younger, was pleased Mystically to signify, That in After-Times, when the *Messias* was come, there would indeed be Two Manner of People, the Elder whereof should give place to the Younger : That is, That then, not the Elder Church of the Religion of *Moses*, who insisted upon Justification by the Works of that Covenant ; but the Younger Church of Believers in *Jesus*, according to God's Call in the Gospel, should be God's elect ; as the Apostle argues against the Jews in that much misunderstood Chapter, the Ninth to the *Romans* : And not only this, but when *Rebekah* also had conceived by one, even by our Father *Isaac* ; For the Children being not yet born, nor having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to Election might stand, not of Works, but of him that calleth, it was said unto her, The Elder shall serve the Younger ; For God had shewed his Mind about this matter in some measure before, by differencing so as he did between *Ishmael* and *Isaac*, the Son of *Hagar*, and the Son of *Sarah*, the Son of the Bond-woman and the Son of the Free, the Son born after

Rom 9.
10, 11, 12.

Gal. 4.
24, 25, 30.

Gen. 1.8,
9, 10.

after the Flesh, and the Child of Promise; in that the former, tho' the Elder Son, he rejected from the Inheritance, and the latter he ordered to be the Heir; Which things are an Allegory, as the inspired Apostle explains the Case: For these are the two Covenants the one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to Bondage, which is Agar: For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem, which now is, and is in Bondage with her Children; And whereas the Scripture saith, Cast out the Bondwoman and her Son For the Son of the Bondwoman shall not be Heir with the Son of the Free woman; the intended Mystical Sense of that Place was this, Cast out the Children of Bondage, who at the appearing of the Messias to make them free should still be fond of Jewish Bondage; for they shall not be Co-heirs with Believers in Him, the free Children of Promise: But whereas the Elder Son Ishmael, was turned out of Doors with his Mother for mocking at Isaac; and perhaps for striking his younger Brother on the Day when he was weaned; and so there was that reason for Ishmael's Exclusion from the Inheritance; upon that Account there might be the less Appearance of any Mystery in His and Isaac's Case: Wherefore, what God did but intimate, by distinguishing between the Person of Ishmael and Isaac in Abraham's Family, He was pleased yet farther, and more clearly

to foreshew by a much more Notable Distinction made between the Posterities of *Esau* and *Jacob* in the Family of *Isaac*. For even before *Esau* and *Jacob* were born, or had done any Good or Evil, it was told *Rebekah*, that the Nation which was to proceed from her Elder Son should serve the Nation that should come from the Younger : Indeed even before *Isaac* was born, God declared that he should be *Abraham's* Heir, and not *Ishmael* ; but then *Ishmael's* foul Behaviour and Evil-doing in persecuting him that was born after the Spirit, as the Apostle expresses it, might seem justly punished with Expulsion from *Abraham's* Family ; especially since *Ishmael* was but the Son of the Bondwoman all the while. But before either *Esau* or *Jacob* were born, or either of them had done any Good or Evil, even though they were both to proceed from the same Womb, and to be Children of one and the same Mother ; it was determined, that the People from the Elder should serve the Posterity of the Younger : And therefore an extraordinary Case of this Nature plainly demonstrated a Divine Mystery to be in it, and it was this ; That in the Days of the *Messias*, when He was come, the Younger Church and People, that should receive him, and submit to His Gospel, were to be the Elect of God, and not the Elder Church of the *Mosaical* Way : This great thing was the Mystical Rea-

p. 150,
151.

Reason of the Divine Will and Pleasure concerning *Edom* and *Israel*, that the Latter should be the Upper House, and be far the more Potent and Flourishing People of the two: And accordingly we may observe, that God's Prediction and Appointment of this kind was mostly verified and accomplished in After-Ages, even to the Time of the Grand Mystery signified by it. Mr. *Whiston* shews in part how it was fulfilled Time after Time: He instances to this purpose in the Victories obtained over *Edom* by *David*, and *Foram*, and *Amaziah*, and *Judas Maccabeus*, and *Hircanus* the Son of *Simon Maccabeus*, but remarks nothing besides; and the Chief Accomplishment of this Noble Prediction, and its main Completion of all hath not minded, but wholly overlooked and omitted. It is true, the Children of *Israel* in several Ages took occasion to engage in War with the *Edomites*, and for the most part, when they fought against them they discomfited and subdued them, and made them their Servants and Tributaries. Sometimes indeed the *Edomites*, in defending themselves got the better so far, that they regained their Ease and Liberty in great measure, and for a while threw off the Yoke of their Bondage to *Israel*: But it seems Time was, when the *Edomites* were grown so haughty and insolent, that they acted offensively against *Israel*, and dar

to invade their Land, and they put many of them to the Sword; and very troublesome and cruel Enemies they proved chiefly, when the Nation of *Israel* was but newly weakened by their other Enemies, into whose Hands God had delivered them for their Sins: For then the *Edomites* sometimes took the Advantage, and fell upon them without any Pity, insulting over them all the while in their Calamity and Distress with horrid Reproaches and Blasphemies; and sometimes they joined with their Enemies against them. Thus they mixed with the *Babylonian* Army, when it came against *Jerusalem*; and when the Children of *Judah* were carried into Captivity, the *Edomites* slew Divers of them, as they were making their Escape. And these Hostilities the *Edomites* committed, to be revenged on the *Israelites* for their past Conquests over them, and for all the Evil they had suffered, during their Subjection to them. But the Wrath of the Lord was kindled against the People of *Edom* for such their Violence against their Brother *Jacob*; because by these Expeditions against *Israel* they attempted to null God's Decree, That the *Israelites* should be the more considerable People, to whom *Edom* must be subject; and for this Cause God denounced Judgments against the *Edomites*, and threatned the Desolation and Destruction of *Mount Seir*, and *Temar*, and

Bozrah, and of all Idumæa, by several of his Prophets, as we find *Jerem.* 49. from the 7th Verse to the 23d. *Ezek.* 25. 12, 13, 14. and Chap. 35. *Joel* 3. 19. *Amos* 1. 11, 12. and particularly in *Obadiah*; for the Subject of *Obadiah's* Prophecy is nothing else. Now the Vengeance and Punishment threatned against *Edom* by *Obadiah*, and other of the Prophets, was inflicted upon that Nation in some of the Days between *Obadiah* and *Malachi*. Which way *Edom* was then brought to Ruin and Destruction, whether chiefly by the Incurfions and Ravage of any of their Heathen Neighbours with which they were threatned, *Jerem.* 49. 14. *Obadiah* 1. or by the Hand of *Israel* for they were threatned likewise with Vengeance from them, *Ezek.* 25. 14. or, whether by God's own more immediate Stroke as by Famine, Earthquakes, Fire from Heaven, or the like, we cannot know certainly: For if any Accounts and Descriptions of *Edom's* great Downfall were ever left upon Record, the History is lost. But so it was. Sometime after *Obadiah's* Prophecy, and before *Malachi's*, God Almighty did one way or other most sorely visit the *Edomites* for their Cruelties to *Israel*. For thus begins *Malachi's* Prophecy, *The Burden of the Word of the Lord to Israel by Malachi*; *have loved you, saith the Lord; yet ye have despised me, saith the Lord; ye have said, Wherein hast thou loved us? Was not Esau our brother?*

cob's Brother? *Saith the Lord ; yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau, and laid his Mountains and Heritage wast for the Dragons of the Wilderness.* A dreadful Judgment had come upon *Edom*, whatever it was in kind; and it proved so destructive, that it shook their whole Constitution, and broke their Strength; and they had now lost, what they could never entirely regain more. Indeed after this dismal Fall they thought to build up themselves again, and to be as great and Powerful again as ever; but God told them plainly by his Prophet, That they should not; as we read in the 4th and 5th Verses of that 1st Chapter of *Malachi*. *Whereas Edom saith we are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate Places; Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, They shall build, but I will throw down; and they shall call them, The Border of Wickedness, and the People against whom the Lord hath Indignation for ever: And your Eyes shall see, and ye shall say, The Lord will be magnified from the Border of Israel.* Wherefore the *Edomites* being thus humbled, and reduced to a lower Condition than ever they were before, since they became a Nation, out of which they were not able to recover themselves, such a signal Calamity befalling them, the Prediction, That they should be a People inferior to *Israel*, was fulfilled in a far greater Degree, than ever it had been yet;

and the *Jews* could more easily vanquish them, and keep them under ever after. And it was this particular and great Completion of the Purpose and Decree of God, That the *Edomites* should be subject to the *Israelites*, which *St. Paul* quotes, when he speaks of the Mystical Meaning of their Case, *Rom. 9. 11, 12, 13.* For we are to observe, That the Apostle takes no Notice of *Israel's* Victories over *Edom*, when *Israel* attacked them in an offensive way; but he refers only to the sore Divine Judgment that came upon them for their having attacked *Israel*; because that was the most Illustrious Accomplishment of the Old Prediction, being the terriblest Blow that ever *Edom* received: For, as *Malachi* tells us then it was that the Lord said, *I have loved Jacob and hated Esau*; when for a just Punishment of *Esau's* Hatred of *Jacob*, and of his insolent and barbarous Behaviour to his Betters, the Lord had but newly laid his Mountains and his Heritage wast for the Dragons of the Wilderness. It is strange, that *Mr. Whiston*, who would be thought so excellent at observing and remarking above other Men, should miss of seeing so plain Thing as this. And so there are Two Defects in his way of handling the Divine Prediction concerning the *Edomites*, and the *Israelites*, That the Elder People should serve the Younger People; he hath given

us but a slighty and imperfect Account of the Accomplishment of the Thing in the Letter; and there he hath done his Work but by Halves: But as to the great Mystery intended by the Prediction and Completion respecting the *Jews*, and the Church of the *Messias*, truly he is pleased to let that quite alone, and he says not a Word of it.

Since Mr. *Whiston* confined not himself to the Prophecies of the *Messias*, as his Text required him to do; but hath handled the Scripture-Prophecies and their Accomplishments at large, without any Difference; methinks at least he should not have left out any such of them, in which the *Messias* was but Mystically meant: And as for those in his Collection, which any way relate to the *Messias*, he ought not to have omitted taking special Notice of such Mystery in them; because that had been keeping to his Text, next to treating of the direct Prophecies of the *Messias*, which were his proper Subject.

Besides these Imperfections in his way of treating on the Scripture-Prophecies, there are other Things in his Book on that Subject, which can hardly escape the Observation of an attentive Reader; and which I think cannot well be passed over without some Reflections; viz.

His Explication of the latter Part of his Text, *Until the Day dawn, and the Day-star*
C 3 *arise*

P. 4.

arise in your Hearts ; which seems very odd and absurd. In a very Magisterial Manner he blames Commentators, and falls foul upon them in divers Places of his Book ; and yet himself is none of the best Expositors of Scripture ; yea, I think, I may say one of the worst that ever I met with. Those Words, *Until the Day dawn, and the Day star arise in your Hearts*, he understands thus ; *Until the great Period and Conclusion of the Scripture-Prophecies, the Exaltation and Advancement of the Kingdom of Christ Jesus over the Jews, and over all the World, be so evident and undeniable, that you will have little need of any external Illumination or Demonstration.* How could that be the Sense of the Apostle ? For hath there been no dawning of Gospel-Light ; no *Morning-Star* arising in the Hearts of Believers after so many Centuries of Christianity, and all the clear Evidences of its Truth ? and will there not be any Thing of that Sort, till *the great Period and Conclusion of the Scripture-Prophecies, the Exaltation and Advancement of the Kingdom of Christ Jesus over the Jews, and over all the World, be evident and undeniable ?* Then again, When the *Exaltation and Advancement of the Kingdom of Christ over the Jews, and over all the World* is come to pass, will there then be no more than a bare dawning of Day ; no more than the *arising* of the *Day-Star* in the Hearts of Christians

Christians
World
less t
fect I
As
positi
of wh
under
matica
please
greate
the mo
are C
describ
great I
and a f
as Joel
Beasts
to so m
distinct
rannic
be ama
Proph
or so m
God's P
Reproac
them :
may ce
small B
ones in
But I w
der and
pouring

istians? Surely the Glorious Revolution in the World he speaks of, must bring with it no less than the Bright Noon-Light, and Perfect Day.

As strange and unaccountable is his Exposition of the *Four small Creatures* in Joel, of which amongst other things, he speaks under his Head of the *Parabolical or Enigmatical* Stile of Prophecy: For, as he is pleased to expound the Prophet there, The greatest Kingdoms of Men are described by the most despicable of Beasts, and Empires are *Cankerworms* and *Caterpillars*. Daniel describes Four Grand Monarchies by *Four great Beasts*, like a *Lyon*, a *Bear*, a *Leopard*, and a *fourth without a Name*; and inasmuch as Joel speaks of just that Number of small Beasts, truly they must needs correspond to so many great ones in Daniel, and mean as distinctly as they the four *Idolatrous and Tyrannical Monarchies*: For, says he, One would be amazed at the *Wonderful Things* which the Prophet Joel ascribes to four small Creatures; or so many kinds of *Locusts*, that by their means God's *Heritage the Jews*, was to be given to *Reproach*, and the *Heathen* were to rule over them: And therefore that the Amazement may cease, we must observe, That the four small Beasts mean the same with the great ones in Daniel, viz. the four Monarchies: But I would fain know, Where's the Wonder and Amazement, that an Army of *Devouring Locusts*, as small Creatures as they

Cap. 1. 4.

2. 25.

p. 10.

are, should expose *God's Heritage* to an Army of Men? I should think rather, it were Matter of great Wonder and Amazement, were it not so, That is, if a sore Fatmine by Locusts did not weaken and impoverish a People to that Degree, as to give them up to Reproach, and to tempt their Enemies to invade them, and rule over them: Nay, therefore the Lord expressly promised to his People, when Penitent, Deliverance from the Famine by Locusts, under the Notion of Deliverance from Heathen-Reproach, *Joel* 2. 19. But methinks it is greatly absurd to suppose, that the same Monarchies of the World should be described in one of the Prophets by the Noblest of the Beasts, in another by the Vilest: This Incongruity in the Scriptures, ought to go near Mr. *Whiston's Heart*, to use an Expression of his own, if he be tenderly concerned for those Sacred Writings, to preserve them in a just Esteem and Veneration amongst Men; especially since there is not the least Colour for thinking, that the *four small Beasts* in *Joel* do correspond to the great ones in *Daniel*, so as to mean the same they do; but only that they are just so many, of the same Number in both Prophets, that is, *Four*; because from the whole Context, and all the Scope of the Prophet, it is very evident, that by the Four kind of Locusts, *Joel* meant properly Four little destructive Creatures, not vast Tyrannical Monarchies; and one would

p. 16.

thin

think nothing can be plainer : For the Lord sent a Famine in *Judea*, c. 1. insomuch that the daily Sacrifice failed, and the *Meat-offering* and the *Drink-offering* was cut off from the *House of the Lord*, c. 1. v. 9. 16. & 2. v. 14. For the Removal of which Judgment, *Joel* prescribed a Publick Fast and Humiliation, c. 1. v. 14. & 2. v. 1. 12. And this Famine was caus'd by a dark Cloud of Locusts falling upon the Earth, who eat up all the Fruits thereof, c. 1. v. 4. 6, 7. & 2. v. 25. For the *Palmer-worm*, and the *Locust*, and the *Canker-worm*, and the *Caterpillar*, were the Nation meant, that came up upon the Land, strong and without Number, whose Teeth were the Teeth of a *Lion*, they were the Great People and a Strong, the Great Army and Camp of the Lord which he sent against the Jews, c. 1. v. 6. & 2. v. 2. 11. 20. 25. An Army, not that killed with the Sword, but devoured the Fruit of the Trees, and the Corn, and Herbs of the Fields, c. 1. v. 6, 7, 10, 11, 12. as the Prophet naturally describes those Creatures, c. 2. v. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9. For he says, *The Appearance of them is as the Appearance of Horses, and as Horsemen so shall they run: Like the Noise of Chariots on the Tops of Mountains shall they leap, like the Noise of a Flame of Fire, that devoureth the Stubble, as a strong People set in Battel array*, v. 4. 5. Therefore most plain it is, that the Prophet doth not speak of the *Assyrian Army*, or of any other real Army

Exod. 10.
19.

Army of Horses or Horsemen, but of a Multitude of Creatures got together in a vast Body, who appeared and moved *like* an Army of Horse and Foot in Battel-Array, and ran *like mighty Men*, and climbed the Wall *like Men of War*, v. 7. And in God's Promise to remove far off from the Land of the Jews, this *Northern Army*, the loathsome Creatures of this kind are farther described by the *Stink* and *Ill Savour* that should come up from them, when driven into a *Land barren and desolate* with their *Face* towards the *East Sea*, and their *Hinder-part* towards the *Utmost Sea*, v. 20. And it was promised to the Jews, not only that God would cause the former and latter Rain to fall for a Plenty amongst them, v. 23. but likewise, that after the Famine, their Corn, and Wine, and Oil should be doubled to them for so many Years as the Famine continued; insomuch that take one Year with another, God would give them the Fruits of the Earth in the same Quantity, as if there had been no Famine at all: *The Floors shall be full of Wheat and the Fats shall overflow with Wine and Oil and I will restore to you the Tears that the Locust hath eaten, the Canker-worm and the Caterpillar, and the Palmer-worm, my great Army which I sent among you, and ye shall eat in Plenty*, v. 24, 25, 26. Who then can imagine, that the Prophet by the *Locusts* should mean Tyrannical Monarchies, when as every Passage, in the two Chapters

the 28th Verse of the 2d Chapter, relates only to the Famine by Locusts, and the scope and Coherence directs us to nothing else: Besides we know, that as Locusts were one of the Plagues of *Egypt*, so the *Israelites* were particularly threaten'd with Armies of those Destroyers, if they disobey'd the Law of the Lord, *Deut.* 28. 38, 39, 42. And Famine by Locusts amongst other Judgments, *Solomon* deprecated in his prayer at the Dedication of the Temple, *1 Kings* 8. 37. *. And there is one Argument more yet behind, which is a plain Demonstration, that *Joel*, by the Four Sorts of Locusts, neither did nor could mean the four Tyrannical Monarchies: If those Monarchies were the Locusts he meant and in-

* Mr. *Whiston* is not pleased with Commentators, because they imagine a Plague of several Kinds of Locusts with a drought and Famine also in *Judea*, for the Interpretation of the book of *Joel*. p. 47, 48. For my part, I do not see how they can imagine otherwise for Interpreting *Joel*; since the prophet doth most plainly speak of a Plague of several Kinds of Locusts God sent upon the Jews: And as to what Mr. *Whiston* says against so necessary an Interpretation, there is little in it: His Argument is, The whole History of the Jewish Nation is utterly silent of a Dearth and Famine in *Judea*: and what then? For so likewise the whole History of the Jewish Nation is utterly silent about that Notable Destruction of the *Edomites*, which came upon them some time between the Days of *Obadiah* and *Malachi*, for a Punishment of their Exalting themselves against their Brother *Jacob*; and yet nevertheless it is most certain, that at that time the Lord laid *Esau's Mountain* and his Heritage waste for the dragons in the Wilderness, by some dreadful Judgment, *Mal.* though we find nothing of it in Jewish or Pagan History.

tend-

tended to speak of, then by the *Palmer-worm* or the *Caterpillar* the last of the Four, *Joel* 4. & 2. 25. he must mean the *Roman Empire* from which as well as the other, the *Jews* were promised to be delivered before the Times of the *Messias*, that is, before the Miraculous Effusion of the Spirit in His Days. *And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, &c.* v. 2. For this Promise of a Fulness of the Spirit in Men and Women, was not to be fulfilled till the *Jews* were first delivered from the four sorts of Locusts, and restored to Fulness of Bread: *Afterward I will pour out my Spirit upon all Flesh*: And since the latter Promise, that of the Spirit, was accordingly made good in its Season, which was not to be fulfilled till after the *Jews* were perfectly delivered from the Locusts of the four kinds; this supposes that the prior Promise, that of Deliverance from the Locusts, was certainly fulfilled before the pouring out of the Spirit. Now we know that the *Jews* were not delivered from the Yoke of the *Roman Tyranny* before the Coming of the Holy-Ghost, no nor after it neither. Nay, a while after the Descent of the Spirit, the supposed Fourth Locust quite devoted the *Jews*, as was foretold in the very Prophecy; their Destruction by the *Roman Power* being called in the Prophecy, *The Great*

and
When
the L
with
he as
Proph
being
kind:
upon
and cle
of the
Bible.
And
Mr. W
ments
an inter
Talent
his Wr
be thou
with m
farther
before h
+ I know
e should
Days of the
fulfilled, w
Locusts or
the Locusts
depended u
rms: But
case the
Empire shou
at Tyrann
not.

and the Terrible Day of the Lord, v. 31. †. Wherefore Mr. *Whiston's* Interpretation of the Locusts in *Joel*, doth by no means carry with it that *sound and rational Import*, which he ascribes to the *Prophetick Stile*; nor is the Prophecy, as expounded by him, capable of *P. 2.* being clearly explained to the Reason of Mankind: And yet he doubts not to say, that upon his *Hypothesis*, all that Prophecy is easy and clear; nay indeed, as it seems to him, one *P. 10. 11.* of the most plain and intelligible in the whole Bible.

And I observe all the while, That tho' Mr. *Whiston* is so very unhappy in his Comments on Scripture, and shews so little Skill in interpreting the Sacred Oracles; for his Talent lies not that way, as appears by his Writings; Nevertheless, he would be thought to have searched the Holy Books with more Accuracy, and to have looked farther into Scripture, than others have done before him. For Instance: Speaking of the

† I know not what Mr. *Whiston* can say to this, unless he should pretend, That the Promise of the Spirit in the Days of the *Messiah*, was absolute, and was therefore to be fulfilled, whether the *Jews* were delivered before from the Locusts or not; whereas the Promise of Deliverance from the Locusts, was Conditional, and the Performance of it depended upon the Repentance and Reformation of the *Jews*: But then, I would ask, Was it promis'd in *Joel*, that in case the *Jews* were Penitent and Obedient, the *Roman* Empire should fall, or that they should be delivered from that Tyranny before the Coming of the *Messiah*? I trow not.

Frophe-

p. 67.

p. 68.

Prophecies, that the Stile thereof is sometimes short, abrupt, and disturbed by the coming on of other matters of a very different Nature, He takes Occasion to reflect on the present Order of the Prophecies in this manner; I must be so free and fair, as to confess, I cannot every where look upon the present Order of the Histories or Prophecies of the Old Testament to have been the Original one, or that which was intended by the Pen-men of them. And however new or strange such an Assertion may appear to some; yet I am confident, whoever duly considers the State of these Holy Books under the Judges, Manasseh, the Babylonish Captivity, and the Prophanation by Antiochus Epiphanes, will rather adore the good Providence of God, that they are in any Degree come entire, and, generally speaking, in good Order to our Hands, than be surprized at a few Defects, or Disorders in some particular Places of our present Copies. And he would be heartily glad, if in such Places, where any Footsteps of Redundancy, Defect, Mistake, or Disorder appear in our present Copies, the several Histories and Prophecies could, upon any sufficient, or even probable Ground, be restored to their own Places, for which they were originally intended. And therefore, since he is the Man, that has made the mighty Discovery of Dislocation, and Disorder in the Copies of Scripture; I suppose for that Reason he accounts himself the fittest Per-

son to
cated
to acc
I thou
scribe
Exact
Perfect
should
be a fe
our pre
been av
do not
there f
duces c
to shew
stamen
that he
perfect
in the
Chapte
of the C
Telling
irely in
Copies;
and ent
of Mos
Chapte
tely in
Lord se
Ark of
the Sep
Service
son

son to undertake the restoring of the dislocated Passages to their proper Places, and to accomplish so great a Design. Now tho' I should agree with him so far, as not to ascribe to our present Copies an absolute Exactness in every Particular, and an entire Perfection of Method every where; and should be willing to own, that there may be a few accidental Mistakes, or Disorders in our present Copies, which could not always have been avoided without a constant Miracle; Yet I do not see how he hath proved Disorder there from the particular Instances he produces out of *Deuteronomy*, and *Ezekiel*. For to shew, That the Copies of the Old Testament are defective in some Places; and that here and there Things are not set in perfect Order, but misplaced; he instanceth in the 6th and 7th Verses of the Tenth Chapter of *Deuteronomy* about the Journeyings of the Children of Israel in the Wilderness; Telling us, That these Two Verses are entirely inserted in a wrong Place in our present Copies; being both imperfect in themselves, and entirely foreign to the Design, and Series of Moses's reasoning in the Beginning of that Chapter. For, whereas it follows immediately in the 8th Verse, *At that time the Lord separated the Tribe of Levi to bear the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord*: He says the Separation of the Tribe of Levi to that Service, was a Thing done not at Jobath, a Land

P. 72.

P. 70.

P. 71.

Land of Rivers of Waters, whither the Israelites came not till long afterwards; which yet the present Insertion implies; but at Horeb, immediately after God's writing upon the Second Tables; of which he had been just before speaking. But surely Mr. Whiston, who pretends to so much Skill and Exactness in Scripture-Chronology, grossly mistakes the Time when the Tribe of Levi was first separated to bear the Ark of the Covenant: He says, This Separation most certainly was done at Horeb, immediately after God's writing on the Second Tables; which is most certainly false. For it is so far from being true, That the Tribe of Levi was separated to the Sacred Service at Horeb, immediately after God's writing upon the Second Tables; that Levi was not so separated, and the First Born of Israel redeemed by the Separation of the Levites, till the Children of Israel were numbred; and the numbring of the Children of Israel was above Seven Months after Moses came down the second time from the Mount with the second Tables: For from the coming of the Children of Israel out of Egypt to their being numb'ed, it was full Thirteen Months; of which near Six Months passed from their Departure out of Egypt, till Moses's Descent from the Mount with the Second Tables, and the other Seven Months, from the Second Tables to the numbring of the People: Which I thus demonstrate

relate : *Moses* went up to Mount *Horeb* in
 the Third Month after the Departure of
 the *Israelites* out of *Egypt* : In his Abode Exod. 19.
1, 3.
 with God in the Mount both times, in each
 of which he was there with God Forty Exod. 24.
18. & 34.
23.
 Days, and Forty Nights, Three Months
 more were spent ; that is, if we take in the
 intermediate Days, in which *Moses* went Deut. 9.
9, 18.
 down from God to the People, before he
 ascended the Mount again. From his com-
 ing down thence the second time, with the
 Second Tables, to the rearing of the Taber-
 nacle, it was Six Months : For the Taber- Exod. 40.
2, 33.
 nacle was set up in the first Day of the first
 Month of the second Year, after the *Israe-*
lites came out of *Egypt* ; and from the Fi-
 nishing of the Tabernacle to the Numbring
 of the People, and Separation of the *Le-* Numb. 1.
1.
vites, it was one Month more, in which Month
Aaron and his Sons were Consecrated Priests.
 Now we find no mention at all of the *Le-*
vites, immediately after God's writing on the
 Second Tables, even not till the Numbring
 of the Children of *Israel*, which was Seven
 Months after. It is true, the Children of
Levi are mentioned at the breaking of the
 first Tables : For we read of them, that
 they joined with *Moses*, and were on the
 Lord's and his side, against the Idolaters
 that worshipped the Golden-Calf ; and for Exod. 32.
26, 28.
 the good Service which they did then, they
 were rewarded at length with the Honour of
 being

being brought near to God, to serve in Holy Things. But we have not a word of the *Levites*, immediately after God's writing upon the *Second Tables*, no, not till the Numbring of the Children of *Israel*; because as yet, there was no occasion for them, and for the Service to which they were afterwards separated. The Office of the *Levites* was to guard and carry the Tabernacle, and to Minister to the Priests: But when *Moses* was newly come down with the *Second Tables*, there was no Tabernacle reared up, no Priests Consecrated; and so as yet there was no occasion for the Separation of the *Levites*, to bear the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord: But when a Tabernacle was erected, and Priests were Consecrated, then and not before, were the *Levites* separated to the Service of the Tabernacle, and to attend on the Priests. Wherefore it is clear that the Separation of the *Levites* was not done immediately after God's writing upon the *Second Tables*; for we see it was not done till above half a Year after; and consequently those Words, *At that time the Lord separated, &c.* are by no means to be referred to the 5th Verse of the Chapter; that is, to *Moses's* Descent from the Mount with the *Second Tables*: And I do grant, that neither can they relate to the Journey to *Jabath*: And I am of Mr. *Whiston's* Mind, that the first Separation of the *Levites* was

long before the *Israelites* came to *Jotbath*,
 a Land of Rivers of Waters ; For the Chil-
 dren of *Israel* were in the Wilderness of *Si-*
ai when they were Numbred, and the *Le-*
uites were first separated : And from that Numb. 1:
 Desert, they took so many Journeys before Numb 33.
 they reached *Jotbath*, that it must be divers 15, 16, 33.
 Years before they arrived thither from *Si-*
ai. And yet it doth not necessarily follow,
 that therefore the two Verses forementioned
 are misplaced ; nor had Mr. *Whiston* reason
 to say, *This is too plain an Instance of a Disor-*
der in our present Copies, to be either denied or
waived by any : For some do refer those
 Words, *At that time*, not to *Moses's* coming
 from the Mount with the Second Tables,
 nor yet to the Journey of the *Israelites* to
Jotbath, but to the Death of *Aaron* ; which
 those Divines do think was mentioned on
 purpose in the 6th Verse, that it might be
 referred to in the 8th Verse ; whose Expo-
 sition therefore of the Place is this, *At that*
time, that is, when *Aaron* died, the Lord se-
 parated the Tribe of *Levi* afresh, to bear the
 Ark of the Covenant of the Lord, and called
 them again to that Office. And so accor-
 ding to this Hypothesis, the two Verses
 which give an imperfect Account of the
 Journeyings of the *Israelites*, were inserted
 for no other end, but to bring in *Aaron's*
Death, and his Son's succeeding him in the
 Office of the Priesthood : *Moses* thinking

good to put the *Israelites* in mind, how that God renewed and confirmed the Tribe of *Levi* in their Separation to the Service of the Tabernacle, the first time they had a new High-Priest to minister to. And the Children of *Israel* took their Journey from *Beeroth* of the Children of *Jaakan* to *Mosera* there *Aaron* died, and there he was buried and *Eleazar* his Son ministred in the Priest's Office in his stead. Not that they Journeyed from *Beeroth* immediately to *Mosera*, or *Mount Hor*; they removed to other Places first: For from thence, that is, from *Beeroth* or *Bene-jaakan*, they journeyed to *Gudgodah* and from *Gudgodah* to *Jotbath*, a Land of Rivers of Waters; and on they went still till after three or four Removals more, they pitched in *Mount Hor*, where *Aaron* died and was Buried: At which time the Tribe of *Levi*, separated, or continued to separate the Tribe of *Levi*, to bear the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord, by making a second and repeated Choice of them for that Business and Employment. Indeed we do not read of a Solemn Confirmation of the *Levites* their Office, in such manner as *Phineas* *Aaron's* Grandson was confirmed in the Priesthood: But the thing is probable enough; and if it be but probable in a Measure, then there is not just Occasion for Complaint of a Dislocation; since the Pretence of Disorder in our present Copy

Numb. 33.
32.

Numb. 33.
34, 35, 36,
37, 38.

Numb. 25.
12, 13.

from
nied
N
ing,
Ezek
of E
also,
severa
Proph
whole
order
Bibles
not see
the Pr
the Fr
ch. I.
* He f
ted the Tr
Lord, foll
too plain a
ther deniea
of Disord
seems he
unluckily
his Chronol
Old Testam
the words
the foregoi
larger exten
space of time
Texts in t
are so to be
undeniable
it seems, he
in Deut. 10.
he had take
clude a grea

from this Instance, may Rationally be denied and evaded.*

Nor is there any more need of pretending, as Mr. *Whiston* does, that the Dates of *Ezekiel's* Prophecy are misplaced in the Book of *Ezekiel*. He complains of Disorder there also, without Cause; He tells us, That the several Dates of the particular Visions in this Prophet, which are more than any other in the whole Scripture, do plainly shew no small Disorder in the present Places they possess in our Bibles. Do they plainly shew this? I cannot see it at all: For the several Dates of the Prophecies and Visions of *Ezekiel*, from the Fifth Year of *Jehoiachin's* Captivity, ch. i. v. 2. to the Five and twentieth, ch.

P. 69.

* He says that those Words, *At that time the Lord separated the Tribe of Levi, to bear the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord*, following the Account of the Journey to *Jothab*, are no plain an Instance of Disorder in our present Copies, to be either denied or evaded by any; and yet this pretended Instance of Disorder hath been one way evaded by himself: But it seems he quite forgot it; and in his Accomplishment he has unluckily happened to contradict what he had observed in his Chronology: For in his short View of the Chronology of the Old Testament, p. 73. he tells us, we must remember that altho' the words, *At that time*, in *Gen. 38. 1.* seem to refer us to the foregoing History of *Joseph*, yet the Expression is of a much larger extent in the Language of Scripture, and includes a great space of time. And this very Place, *Deut. 10. 8.* is one of his Texts in the Margin, in which the Words, *At that time*, are so to be understood; and yet nevertheless, to shew an undeniable Instance of Disorder in our present Copies, which, it seems, he is hugely fond of proving, those very Words in *Deut. 10. 8.* he restrains to the Journey to *Jothab*, which he had taken before to be of a much larger extent, and to include a greater space of time.

40. v. 1. are placed one after another in a natural and regular Order, from Year to Year, and Month to Month, and Day to Day. *Ezekiel's* first Vision was in the *Fifth Year* of *K. Jehoiachin's* Captivity, *ch. 1. v. 2.* His next Vision was in the *Sixth Year* of that King's Captivity, in the *sixth Month*, in the *fifth Day* of the Month, *ch. 8. v. 1.* After that we read that he Prophecied in the *seventh Year* of the same Epoque, in the *fifth Month*, the *tenth Day* of the Month, *ch. 20. v. 1.* there being no Date of his other Prophecies preceding. Then he Prophecied in the *ninth Year*, in the *tenth Month*, in the *tenth Day* of the Month, *ch. 24. v. 1.* Then in the *tenth Year*, in the *tenth Month*, in the *twelfth Day* of the Month, *ch. 29. v. 1.* Then in the *eleventh Year*, in the *first Day* of the Month; that is, of the first Month of that Year, as must be supposed, *ch. 26. v. 1.* Then in the *eleventh Year* also, in the *first Month*, in the *seventh Day* of the Month, *ch. 30. v. 20.* Then again in the *eleventh Year*, in the *third Month*, in the *first Day* of the Month, *ch. 31. v. 1.* Then in the *twelfth Year*, in the *twelfth Month*, in the *first Day* of the Month, *ch. 32. v. 1.* And last of all was his Great Vision of the Temple and City; to wit, *In the Five and twentieth Year*, in the *beginning* of the Year, or first Month of the Year, in the *tenth Day* of the Month, *ch. 40. v. 1.* In all which Series of Dates, there is but one that stands

stands not in that exact Order ; to wit, the Date of the Prophecy against *Tyre* and *Sidon* ; which Date being the *eleventh Year*, ch. 26. v. 1. is placed before the Date of another Prophecy, which is the *tenth Year*, ch. 29. v. 1. But this may be well enough accounted for, without making any Dislocation in the Copy. *Ezekiel's* Prophecy against *Egypt* began in the *tenth Year*, ch. 29. He Prophecied against *Tyre* and *Sidon* in the *eleventh Year*, Chapters 26, 27, 28. And in the same *Eleventh Year* he went on again with Prophecying against *Egypt* ; yea, he Prophecied twice against *Egypt* in that Year, ch. 30. v. 20, and 31. v. 1. and once in the *twelfth Year*, ch. 32. v. 1. Now therefore the Case being thus, the Penman's meaning in placing the Prophecy in the *eleventh Year* before that in the *tenth*, one easily sees is this, That *Ezekiel's* Prophecy against *Egypt* in the Four Chapters, the 29th, 30th, 31st, and 32d, might all of it be read together, separately and entirely by it self, without the Interposition of another Prophecy : Whereas, if part of the Prophecy against *Egypt* in the *tenth Year*, had been set before the Prophecy against *Tyre* and *Sidon* in the *eleventh*, as it was given before it ; then the latter Prophecy had been inserted into the former, and the one must have come in between the sever'd Parts of the other ; which had not been the best way of placing

placing large Prophecies on different Subjects.

p. 68.

But his only particular Proof of Disorder in *Ezekiel*, is from the beginning of *Ezekiel's* Prophecy; that having a *double Date*, to wit, *the thirtieth Year* of something not expressed, and *the fifth Year* of *King Jehoiachin's Captivity*; and all the Comments of Expositors upon this double Date, he rejects as *poor and vain Conjectures* advanced thereupon. He will have it, that the Vision of *Ezekiel* is ascribed to two different Years of *Jehoiachin's Captivity*: But that is very strange, since the Words in the Parenthesis (*which was the fifth Year of King Jehoiachin's Captivity*) do manifestly refer to another Epocha before it; it being as plain, that *Ezekiel's* first Vision hath a double Epocha, as it is, that there are two Epocha's in his last Vision, viz. *The five and twentieth Year of the Captivity*, and *the fourteenth Year after the City was smitten*, ch. 40. v. 1. Nor is it reasonable to suppose, that *Ezekiel* Prophesied in the *thirtieth Year* of *Jehoiachin's Captivity*, when as his last Vision mentioned in the Prophecy of his Book, was but in the *five and twentieth*. He says, that *Jehoiachin's Captivity* is the only Epocha made use of in this whole Book: And I do grant, that in all the Dates from the 2^d Verse of the 1st Chapter, to the 1st Verse of the 40th, is the only Epocha; but the Prophecy be-

gin

gins in the 1st Verse of the 1st Chapter, with another Epocha distinct from *Jehoiachin's* Captivity, as is evident. And the several Opinions of Divines concerning that Epocha, what it should be, are, I suppose, *the poor and vain Conjectures, and vain Guesses*, that he means, and which he thinks it not worth his while to repeat. Some think the Epocha, or *Æra*, from which the *thirtieth Year* is counted, was the Birth of the Prophet; Others, the Year of Jubilee; Others, the finding the Book of the Law in King *Josiah's* Time; but others rather take it to be the beginning of the Reign of *Nabopolassar*, or King *Nebuchadnezzar* the First: For that was a new *Æra* instituted by Authority, and much observed throughout the *Babylonian* Empire: And upon this I fix as the true intended *Æra*, from which the *fifth Year* of *Jehoiachin's* Captivity was the *thirtieth Year*, as hath been computed. And this is no *vain Guess*; For the Reign of *Nebuchadnezzar* and *Jehoiachin's* Captivity, were the two Epocha's at the end of the Book of *Jeremiah*, ch. 52. v. 29, 30, 31. With which therefore it may well be concluded, that *Ezekiel's* Prophecy begins: And then besides, the No-mention of any particular *Æra* in the first Verse, but only of the *thirtieth Year* of, or from, something, shews what was the *Æra* meant; to wit, the beginning, or first Year of the Reign of the Elder *Nebuchadnezzar*,
the

the Grand *Chaldean* Monarch; for that was a more Noble *Æra*, and much more noted than *Jehoiachin's Captivity*: And to be sure, it was known most of all at *Babylon*, the Metropolis of the Empire, where *Ezekiel* was when he wrote the Visions, and other Revelations of his Book. And for that Reason, because it was so known an *Æra*, from which the *Chaldean* Astrologers commonly counted in Dates of Years, Months, and Days, there was less need of his mentioning it expressly in his first Date. And yet nothing will serve Mr. *Whiston*, but the Thirtieth Year in the first Verse, that is, of *Jehoiachin's Captivity*, as he supposes, must be a *Supernumerary Date*, not placed right where it is, but should be set elsewhere; and he would bear us in hand, that *Ezekiel's* Book is begun wrong with a *double Date*; for that it ought to have begun not with the *Thirtieth*, but only with the *Fifth* Year of that *Captivity*. And he doth not only tell us, that the *Thirtieth* Year is a Dislocation, but for a Specimen of his Skill in rectifying Disorder, and restoring Dislocated Texts to their true Places he directs us to the very Chapter in *Ezekiel* to which, as he thinks, that Date of right belongs. Says he, *I take the first Date to be only a Dislocation, and that it belongs to the beginning of the Thirtieth Chapter of that Prophecy, which has no particular Date.* And are there not divers other Prophecies in *Eze-*

kiel

Ezekiel's Book, to which no particular Date
 is affix'd? No less than Eighteen times doth
Ezekiel Preface his distinct Prophecies in
 this manner; *And the Word of the Lord*
came unto me, saying; without mentioning
 at all the Year, or Month, or Day of his se-
 veral Inspirations: Why therefore the first
 Date should be clapt on to the beginning of
 the 30th Chapter, rather than to any other
 of the Dateless Prophecies, no Body in the
 Earth can imagine. This then I am sure is
 a poor and vain Conjecture, and a vain Guess
 utterly groundless. But he adds, That both
 the Series and the Contents most exactly agree
 with this very Supernumerary Date. How do
 they most exactly agree with it? This ap-
 pears not at all: For as to the Contents and
 Subject-Matter of the 30th Chapter, how
 both the first Date agree with the Prophecy
 against *Egypt*, more than with the Prophecy
 against the *Mountains of Israel*, ch. 6. v. 1, 2. or a-
 gainst the *Ammonites*, ch. 25. v. 1, 2. or against
 Mount *Seir*, and all *Idumea*, ch. 35. v. 1, 2, 15.
 against the *Land of Magog*, ch. 38. v. 1,
 &c. And then the Series will by no means
 bear a removal of the first Date to the be-
 ginning of the 30th Chapter: For since the
 Dates from the Fifth Year of *Jehoiachin's*
 Captivity, to the Twenty fifth, do all stand in
 exact Order from Year to Year, excepting
 only that the Eleventh Year is once set be-
 fore the Tenth, surely to place the Thirtieth
 Year

c. 6. v. 1. &
 7. v. 1. &
 12. v. 1. &
 13. v. 1. &
 14. v. 1. &
 v. 12. & 15.
 v. 1. & 16.
 v. 1. & 17.
 v. 1. & 18.
 v. 1. & 21.
 v. 1. & 22.
 v. 1. & 23.
 v. 1. & 25.
 v. 1. & 33.
 v. 1. & 34.
 v. 1. & 35.
 v. 1. & 38.
 v. 1.

Year of the same supposed Epocha in the midst of a Series of Dates from the 5th Year to the 25th, and to throw it in there, would be a gross misplacing of that Date; and so Mr. *Whiston*, instead of setting a pretended Disorder right, would make one where there was none before. By which we may see, what miserable Work this Writer would make in all likelihood, if he took in hand to rectify Dislocations in *our present Copies*; and we may justly expect that he would leave things in Scripture a great deal worse than he found them. He wishes *it were but half as easy to restore the right Order of some misplaced Histories and Visions, in all the other Books of the Old Testament, as it is to restore those in Ezekiel.* But if those *misplaced Histories and Visions in all the other Books of the Old Testament*, which he wishes were placed right, can be restored to their True Order no better than he has restored the first Date in *Ezekiel*, truly in my Opinion they had far better be let alone; and wish they may all keep where they are.

Besides these unaccountable Passages in his Book, I shall not omit to take notice of another of the same Nature, which is less obnoxious to Censure; and that is the Note on St. *Matthew's* Citation from the Prophets, That *Jesus* should be called a *Nazarene*. He says, That this Place is *found in the present Copies of the Old Prophe*

And true it is, that the very Words of the Prophecy, as cited by the Evangelist, are no where to be found in our present Copies. But he ventures to say withal, *This is so far from a Wonder, that among such a great Number of Citations out of the Prophets of the Old Testament, one or two should plainly appear to be either wanting, or false Transcrib'd in our present Copies; that without such a Miraculous Interposition, as we have no reason to suppose, any other Condition of those most ancient Books must appear little less than impossible.* By which he insinuates, that he believes the Prophecy was *Verbatim* in the most ancient Books, as St. Matthew cites it, though now it is missing, and we meet not with it in our Copies. Whereas I should think that a Prophecy of the *Messias*, which was committed to Writing at first, that it might be a standing Testimony on Record, ever ready to be appealed to, and cited in all Ages, is too Material and Important a Scripture to be *wanting, and false Transcribed in our present Copies*: Nor can the loss of such a Scripture from the Canon, or its Corruption, be supposed to consist with a Divine Vigilance for the Preservation of those Sacred Books; especially if the Matter foretold be spoken of not by one Prophet only, but by the Prophets; that is, inculcated by divers of them: For he says, *That most of the eminent and ancientest Predictions of the Old Testament*

p. 248,
249.

stament are very seldom trusted to one single place, or to one single exactness of the Copy, but are generally contained in several Places, all to the very same purpose, for the Prevention probably of the Mischief which might otherwise arise, from the Carelessness or Mistakes of Transcribers, and from the several Accidents which those most ancient Books were to run through in future Ages. If then a Prophecy be secured against Mischief this way, to wit, by a frequent Repetition of it in the Prophets, still might Mischief arise from the Carelessness or Mistakes of Transcribers, &c. ? But to shew how groundless is the Fancy, that this Prophecy cited by St. Matthew was in the Ancient Books Word for Word, but is wanting, or false Transcrib'd in our present Copies ; If it were really true, that this Prophecy hath been lost or depraved, as he imagines, then this Mischief happened either before the coming of Christ, and St. Matthew's time, or since. We cannot suppose that the Prophecy hath been left out, or Transcrib'd wrong, since the Evangelist cited it : For the Comfort is, we may be very sure, that the first Apologists for the Faith of Christ, and all the succeeding Champions for the Cause of the Gospel, have in all Ages of the Church constantly guarded the Copies of the Prophetick Writings, from any such material Alteration in them, as might be prejudicial to Christianity ; and have all along taken special care, that none

of the Prophecies of the Old Testament quoted by the Writers of the New, in Proof that *Jesus* is the *Messias*, should be lost or corrupted. If the Mischief happened before Christ, then surely the Evangelist must know of it : For we cannot well think that *St. Matthew*, who was an Apostle, and so a Person Illuminated by Inspiration to know the most Ancient Scriptures, should be ignorant of this supposed Material Defect in the Copies that were in his time : And if he knew it, then, I pray, to what purpose did he cite a Place as out of the Prophets, which he knew was not to be found in them ? For such a Citation could be no Proof that *Jesus* is the Christ, except only to those who perhaps might believe from Tradition, that anciently there was such a Prophecy : Nay, he could not but be sensible, that the quoting of a Prophecy so where to be found, would not a little disserve and discredit the Christian Cause, by giving occasion to the Enemies of the Gospel to Insult and Triumph. Wherefore, with great Reason have Christian Interpreters Vindicated and Defended the Evangelist against the *Jews*, without supposing or imagining at all our present Copies faulty, or answering the *Jews* in *Mr. Whiston's* way ; which scarce any modern Expositors have offered to do, and none of the Ancients that I know of,

of, except * One. Divines do rather say, That though it be no where Prophecied in exprefs Words, that *Jesus* should be called *Nazarene*, or be one, yet the Sense of what

* *St. Chrysostom* in his Gloss on the cited Prophecy, differs from *St. Jerome*, and the generality of Expositors. *Hom. 9. on Matth. 2.* That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophets, He shall be called a *Nazarene*; *Πατριάρχης τῆτο εἶμι; μὴ ἀπεργάζεσθαι μὴδὲ πολυπραγμονεῖν πολλὰ δὲ ἀποφθιτῶν ὑπάρχοντα βιβλία, &c.* For he supposes that a great part of the old Prophetick Scriptures had perished through the Negligence, or Wickedness of the People of *Israel*, in whose Custody they were; and he instances particularly in *Deuteronomy*, a Volume which says was very near being utterly lost. But blessed be God the Book of the Law was found at length in good Keeping *Joſiah's* Days; and that Sacred Oracle, which had been laid up as it were in the House of the Lord for a while, and hidden there safe from Casualty and Injury, came forth and was produced and read in one of the best of Reigns. And that was a very Remarkable Providence. The Father adds farther, What Marvel is it, if some of the Sacred Books happened to be thrown by in a Publick Confusion, and to be destroyed in the Destruction of the Church and Temple? And he speaks to the same purpose in the Seventh Homily, on the First Epistle to the *Corinthians*. Well, but still I say, That the Oracles of God have been all along constantly preserved by the Good Providence of God, notwithstanding all these things; and the vigilant Divine Eye upon them, hath been a sufficient and constant Security against all that Mischief, which otherwise might have arisen from the Carelessness of Transcribers, or the incurious keeping of them, to whom they were committed, and the Injuries of Times. It is true, Books have been lost, which the Sacred Writers have quoted; but they doth not follow, that because the Inspired Writers quoted Passages from those Books, therefore the cited Books were Divinely Inspired; any more than it follows, that the Book of *Aratus* was Inspired, because *St. Paul* quoted a Place from it, *Acts 17. 28.* For the Writers of Scrip

the Evangelist here quotes and means concerning *Jesus*, is to be found in the Old Testament, and is delivered by several of the Prophets, whether the Word Nazarene be from *Netzer*, a Branch, or from *Nazir*, a separate Person. [*Si fixum de Scripturis fuisset exemplum, nunquam diceret quod dictum*

we cited divers Books, not as Books of Scripture themselves. Nay, the same Prophetical Men, who have sometimes written by Inspiration, have at other times written without it, when in their Writing, the Word of the Lord came not to them; and they had no Revelation of the Spirit; but without any Divine Motion what they wrote was their own Private Work, and themselves could distinguish the Difference. I do conceive that no Inspired Writing from *Moses* to *Christ*, was ever lost or corrupted: I profess to believe, that we have the Whole, Entire, and genuine Word of God, as it was given forth from the Spirit, and by the Sacred Penmen committed to Writing; and I am verily persuaded, that the Originals have been faithfully Transcrib'd, and that there are no Mistakes that are material, no Errors of Consequence in the present Copies: At least, I think I may say, no Book can prove to the contrary. It cannot be shewn, that any of the Inspired Writings of the Prophets have been destroyed, or that any of their Prophecies have been false or miscrib'd. *What Advantage hath the Jew, and what Profit there of Circumcision?* Much every way, chiefly because unto them were committed the Oracles of God, Rom. 3. 1, That Honour, says St. Paul, was peculiar to them; doubtless they had then faithfully kept the Precious Testament committed to them, and the Holy Oracles were pure and uncorrupt in their Hands, because the Apostle says nothing to the contrary. And indeed in all the Discourses of our Saviour and his Apostles against the *Jews*, we do not find that the *Jews*, or their Forefathers, are once charged for diminishing or falsifying any of the Scriptures of the Prophets, but rather the *Jews* were bidden to search the Scriptures that they had with them, John 5. 39. And

E

the

Etum est per Prophetas, sed simpliciter quod dictum est per Prophetam; nunc autem pluraliter Prophetas vocans ostendit se non verba de Scripturis sumpsisse, sed sensum. St. Jerom upon the Place, Tom. 6.] The Difficulty is How was our Lord's Dwelling in Nazareth a fulfilling the Prophecy, that he should be called a Nazarene? Whereas it was Prophecied, that he should be so called, not as dwelling in *Nazareth* so much, as because he was to be a Branch, or a *Nazarite* by Separation? To this I Answer, That some do gather from the first and second Verses of the Ninth Chapter of *Isaiah*, compared with *Matth.* 4. 13, 14, 15. that *Nazareth* as being a Town in the Land of *Zabulon* was foretold to be the Place of the *Messiah* chief Residence: And if that Circumstance of the *Messias* was foretold, then St. *Matth.* might well observe the Completion of the Prophecy, even in the Name of his Town

the Primitive Believers were highly commended for doing so, *Acts* 17. 11. which plainly supposes the Integrity and Purity of the Sacred Copies at that time. And yet *Whiston* seems rather apt to think, that the Jews corrupted their Scriptures: For he speaks of the Books of *Moses*, that part of the Old Testament, which appears by the *Sacred* *Pentateuch*, to have been preserved the most uncorrupted thro' all the latter Ages of the Jewish Commonwealth, p. 1. Whereby he plainly suggests his Opinion, that the rest of the Jewish Canon probably hath been corrupted in some measure; nay, and even the *Pentateuch* it self, though it be of all, Those Five Books passing with him for the most uncorrupt part of the Bible.

whi

which was chiefly indeed to be fulfilled in the Character of his Person ; or at least since *Nazareth* and *Nazarene*, whatever the Evangelist meant by the latter Word, are Words which are so near being the same, inasmuch that the very Name of his Town seemed to agree to his Character describ'd in Prophecy, the Evangelist's speaking of the former might very well give him occasion to mention the fulfilling of Old Prophecies in the latter. But such Comments as these Mr. *Whiston* rejects, as not worth his binding ; and nothing will serve him, but telling us in plain Terms, That the cited Prophecy is *either wanting, or false Transcrib'd*. Amongst other Commentators, Dr. *Hammond* and Bishop *Kidder* in particular, have Expounded the Citation at large much in the same manner, neither of them claiming in the least, that our Copies are defective in the Case ; to both whom I refer the Reader.

Likewise I find something else in his Book, which is as *new* and *strange* to me, as Assertion of the Imperfection of the Sacred Copies may appear to some, viz. His Doctrine concerning Christ's Second Coming, which is very Heterodox and Unsound. He finds fault with Commentators, because they deny that ever the *Messias* is to come a second time, to save and restore the Jewish Nation : Says he, *The Ancient Prophecies of the*

p. 41.

p. 39

P. 42.
 Messias are of two sorts ; some of them concern his first coming to suffer, and destroy the Jewish Nation for their Rejection of the Messias, the rest of them concern his second coming, to advance his Kingdom, and restore the Jews. So that according to Mr. Whiston, Christ's Second Coming is to save and restore the Jewish Nation : For he says, That the Messias was first to come in a mean and low Condition to die for the Sins of the World, and to plant a Spiritual Kingdom, that should generally be in a mean and low Condition also, and under Tyranny and Persecution for many Ages ; and then afterwards he will come in Glory to restore and gain the Kingdom to Israel, to put a final Period to all Idolatry and Persecution, and to advance an everlasting Dominion over Jew and Gentile, after both are become Christians, to the Ends of the Earth. I might easily run over a great Number of the Prophecies of the Old Testament, and shew the Footsteps of the Double Coming of the Messias all along. This is New Divinity, and to my thinking, a very strange Notion of the Double Coming of the Messias : And yet Mr. Whiston says,
 P. 43.
 This Truth begins already to be too clear, to be hid any longer. A Precious Discovery indeed ! For my part, ever since I learnt my Catechism, and therein my Creed, it has been my Faith all along concerning the Two Comings of Christ, That the Christ was to Suffer in the Flesh, and the Other

will be to Judge the World. And I conceive the Apostle to the *Hebrews*, speaking of Christ's Coming the First, and a Second time, mentions only them Two. *Christ was once offered to bear the Sins of many, and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without Sin unto Salvation.* But Mr. *Whiston* tells us of the Coming of the *Messias* a Second time, before his Second Coming, even to *set up his Kingdom before the end of the World*: That there will be a Restoration of the *Jews* in God's due time, and a Coming of Christ for that purpose. I believe no less than Mr. *Whiston*, though I believe no such thing, as a *Restoration of the Jewish Worship, and Laws of Moses*, nor that the *Restoration of the Jews* is a considerable time to precede their Conversion to the *Christian Faith*: But Christ's Coming to convert and save the *Jews*, is by no means his Coming a Second time, as oppos'd to his first coming into the World in Person; for Christ's Coming is of two quite different sorts, Personal and Providential; between which two Mr. *Whiston* ought to have distinguished, but I perceive he was not aware of all of the Distinction. Christ comes by his Power and Providence: For *all Power* is given to him *in Heaven and on Earth*, and he is *Head over all things in the Church*, and he over-rules as he pleases in the Kingdoms of Men. Thus in the Administration of his

Heb. 9. 28.

P. 41.

Essay on
the Resto-
ration of
the Jews.P. 225,
226.Matth. 28
18.

Ephes. 1.

22.

Government, he is said to come to Execute just Judgment upon the obstinate *Jews*, *John* 21. 22. and to punish Degenerating Churches, *Rev.* 2. 5. And in this Sense there have been so many Comings of Christ in the Ages of the Church, as there have been Changes and Revolutions, that he hath caused in the World : And thus he will come to convert and save the *Jews*, in the proper Time and Season. Which Coming of Christ therefore, may be said to be his Coming rather a *Twentieth*, than a *Second Time*, because there were to be divers Providential Comings of Christ, between his Two Personal ones. If Mr. *Whiston* had said, That as Christ once came to overthrow the State and Polity of the *Jews*, so he would come a second time upon their Score, *viz.* to restore and save them by a like Signal Act of his Power and Providence, that had been true and proper, and good Sense ; but it is very improper to say, that Christ will come a second time to restore the *Jews* ; as if his coming then for that purpose would be another Personal Coming, like his First Coming into the World ; since his coming for the Conversion and Restoration of the *Jews* will not be in Person, any more than he came in Person to destroy their City and Government. Indeed Mr. *Whiston* blunders in jumbling together, and confounding two distinct Comings of Christ, as if they were

but o
Christ
stroy t
the M
fer wa
destroy
Nor
self ab
restored
tells us,
and rest
Kingdom
the latte
one of
tion of t
is what
the Worl
will rest
the End
of the W
ation of
season of
ow to t
restoration
e in th
nd of th
Lastly,
are no one
pecially t
ubt, tha
as a
und
himself,

but one and the same : For he says, That *Christ's First Coming* was to suffer, and to destroy the Jewish Nation for their Rejection of the *Messias* ; whereas his First Coming to suffer was in Person, but his Coming afterwards to destroy the Jewish Nation, was not in Person. P. 39.

Nor is Mr. *Whiston* consistent with himself about the Time when the *Jews* shall be restored : For in some Places of his Book he tells us, that the *Messias* shall come to save and restore the Jewish Nation, and to set up his Kingdom before the End of the World, and in the latter Ages of the World ; And again in one of his Essays, he speaks of the Restoration of the Jewish Worship and Laws of Moses, P. 41. 260.

as what shall come to pass towards the end of the World : Elsewhere he tells us, that God will restore the *Jews* to their own Country in the End of the World. (And surely the End Essay on the Restoration, p. 227.

of the World will be too late for the Restoration of the *Jews* : To be sure that is no reason of Conversion ;) and who knows how to take him, since he says, that the same restoration of the *Jews* by the *Messias*, shall come in the End of the World, and before the End of the World ? P. 55. 218. Essay, p. 227.

Lastly, Whereas he says with Confidence, *There is no one that reads the Ancient Prophecies, especially the Nine last Chapters of Ezekiel can doubt, that in the future Kingdom of the Messiah a most Glorious Temple is to be built under the Conduct of the Messiah himself, and as the Place of his Habitation* P. 260, 255, 264.

P. 223,
225.

on among his People Israel in those latter Ages of the World ; which he repeats in his Essay forementioned ; I observe, says he, that the Restoration of the Jews to their own Land in the General, and the Rebuilding of their Temple, with the Restoration of their Sacrifices according to Ezekiel's Description and Model, is not a thing of doubt or uncertainty in the Prophetic Writings, but the thing that above all others they every where foretell and describe in the plainest and most Emphatical Words imaginable ; and he calls it the grand Event of Scripture-Prophecy. I purposed therefore a short Comment on the Prophecies and Promises of the Restoration of the Jews to their own Land, as also of Ezekiel's Vision in the Nine last Chapters of his Book ; but I soon found, that an Explication of those Scriptures tho' as brief as possible, must be a Discourse a great deal too large to be added to what I have said, who have much exceeded the ordinary Bulk of a Preface already.

The Remainder of my Preface therefore shall be a word or two concerning my Publishing this Work. Some perhaps will be apt to say, that Mr. Whiston's Accomplishment of the Prophecies might have lain unanswered, and been suffered e'n to go as it is without danger of any great Hurt coming by it, inasmuch as it is likely few will mind or regard it ; and therefore my Pains might as well have been spared : My Opinion rather

Th

That as on the one hand we cannot well esteem his Book to be of that good Use to the World, which answers the End of Mr. Boyle's Lecture ; so on the other hand it is not to be despised, as if it could do no harm. For since it contains Sermons preached at a Lecture set up for Strength'ning the Foundations of Christianity, and to be read amongst other Tracts on that Subject, by *Jews* and other Infidels in Ages to come ; who knows, what Ill Effects so strange a Piece may produce in time, if hereafter it should be found altogether uncensored, and the Poison went Abroad without Provision against it ; without any Care to send out an Antidote after it ? especially seeing the Errors of his Book, may receive no little Countenance and Authority from its being written by One of Note and Learning ; and published in an Age of Learning, and dated from a Place of Learning, and Printed at the University-Press : Nay the Editors of *the History of the Works of the Learned*, for the Month of *December*, in the Year 1707, have highly praised his Expositions of the Prophecies, and have recommended them to the World, and referred us to them, as well worth our Reading and Perusing ; and so by that Means have confirmed him in his gross Mistakes, and done as much as in them lies, towards misleading others into the same ; which is a farther Reason for Answering his Book : For after abstracting

P. 390.
Cam-
bridge,
Dec. 9.
1707.

Censura
Tempo-
rum.
Numb. 1.
P. 18.

abstracting his Discourses on Three of the Predictions of the *Messias*, Those Gentlemen are pleased to add concerning the Rest, p. 75. *There are many other Prophecies relating to the Messias, which were foretold in the time of the Patriarchs, or after the Settlement of the Jewish Church, that are explained with great Judgment by our Learned Author.* This I have much wondered at; For are *Numb. 24. 17. & 2 Sam. 7. 14. and Psal. 8. 6. and Psal. 72. 17. and Psal. 78. 2. and Isai. 7. 14, 15, 16. and Hosea 11. 1.* Prophecies of the *Messias* explained by Mr. *Whiston* with great Judgment? I will shew the contrary: So likewise *Eubulus*, in the Dialogue, is pleased to commend Mr. *Whiston's Accomplishment of the Scripture-Prophecies* as a Performance, in which he has acquitted himself with great Care and Judgment, and with equal Perspicuity and Evidence, Cujus Contrarium est verissimum, as has been seen already in great part, and shall be shewn farther. However I am glad to find, that I am not alone in my Opinion, that Mr. *Whiston's Accomplishment of the Scripture-Prophecies*, is a Piece not to be endured, but requir'd an Answer: For Mr. *White*, and Mr. *Wright*, and Dr. *Jenkins*, have written against it; and indeed I should have very much marvelled, if so very obnoxious Book had altogether escaped without Remarks.

And whereas the Delay of this Answer to Mr. *Whiston*, may seem to stand in need of an Apology ; and some will be ready to think, that it ought to have appeared sooner ; I have this to say for my self, that since the Publication of Mr. *Whiston*'s Book, more than ordinary Avocations one after another have happen'd to come in my way, which have retarded the finishing my intended Reflections upon it. But however, if what I have done may serve to check and chastise the insolence of this Man's Pen, and to make Judgmen write for the Future with more Care and modesty, and less Confidence in his own Judgment ; and if in this Treatise those Prophecies or other Scriptures are cleared and illustrated, which he, after his New Way Interpretation, hath perverted and wrested from their Genuine Sense ; if my Work may be of Use for these Purposes ; This Book's coming out something later than might be expected, I hope the World will excuse.

A Vin-

AVi
tato
som
fias
Hi



LE

typical I
bristian
fions ;
is No
e Mess
aintain
observa
e fan
ely I
thirteen
xteent
es ; an
ore th

I
*A Vindication of those Commem-
tators who have expounded
some Prophecies of the Mes-
sias not to be meant only of
Him.*



*R. Whiston's Tenth Observa-
tion, Preparatory to his Scrip-
ture-Prophecies, is this,
That the Stile and Language
of the Prophets is ALWAYS
single and determinate,
and NOT CAPA-*

p. 13.

*LE of those double Intentions, and
typical Interpretations, which most of our late
Christian Expositors are so full of upon all Oc-
casions; and I find he is extremely fond of
his Notion concerning the Prophecies of
the Messiah: For he spends divers Pages to
maintain it, being very large upon his Tenth
Observation; and he pretends to make out
the same in his Observation immedi-
ately preceeding, and again in the
thirteenth, as also in his First, and
sixteenth, and Twenty Second Prophe-
cies; and indeed there was need of Pains
more than ordinary for clearing his Point:
For*

p. 43.

p. 88.

214. 247.

For says he, *This Observation*, his darling Notion, *tho' in it self so highly reasonable, is so entirely contrary to almost all the Christian Explications of latter Tears*, that I must be somewhat particular in the Demonstration of it. How well he hath demonstrated his Observation, which is *so entirely contrary to almost all the Christian Explications of latter Tears*, and so peculiar to himself, we shall see by and bye.

Mr. Whiston's rude Reflections on the Moderns.

One thing I cannot but observe of Mr. Whiston, and it is pretty plain to me That he is a Man, who greatly affects Singularity in Opinion, and New Discoveries he loves at his Heart; that is, when he thinks himself only is so happy as to make them. And the Vanity of admiring himself for finding out, as he supposes, the Errors of Commentators, hath carried him a great deal too far in his Reflections, even beyond that Modesty, which had become him better. It was not enough for him to represent them as mistaken, but withal he speaks of their Explications, where they differ from him, with all the Expressions of Contempt and Disdain that he could readily devise: For such Comments of theirs he calls *Ill-grounded and unhappy Mistakes, little Evasions and Criticisms, trifling and absurd Evasions, Interpretations never to be proved by Christians, and appearing very absurd to Unbelievers; Expositions in strange and preposterous Method; poor and vain Conjectures, vain Guesses*: And he spares no

P. 19.

P. 20.

P. 38.

P. 68, 69.

Some Prophecies of the Messias.

3

the most Learned amongst the Moderns, even their Expositions are *groß and mistaken*, and none can escape his Censure; and he says, *'Tis a sad and unhappy strait to which our Modern Expositors* (that is, who interpret any Prophecies of the *Messias* to be double-sensed) *are driven to, when they are to deal with the Jews, and defend the Cause of Christianity*: And in his *Advice for the Study of Divinity*, he is pleased to pass another such sort of Complement on the most Learned Divines of the Christian Church, to wit, *that though it be a great shame to the Christian Commentators, that the very Modern Jewish Rabbies themselves; among all their other Trash, should better understand and explain much of the Holy Scriptures, than the most Learned Christians; yet so it is in Fact*. And in truth it hath been mostly the way of Conceited Novelists to call them Fools and Asses, that subscribe not presently to their upstart Positions. Nay, which is worse still, he can hardly allow the Modern Commentators to be honest Men: He attributes their Expositions to *Ill-grounded Prejudice*, and he doth not show how Upright and Judicious men can satisfy their own Consciences in making such poor excuses, and using such miserable Subter-fuges, they do very often upon some occasions; and which is sharpest of all, he says, that by *supposing Double Senses and Typical Interpretations*, they render our Holy Faith suspected of standing

P. 28.

P. 17.

Sermons
and Essays.
P. 311.

P. 261.

P. 17.

P. 20, 21.

standing in need of Support from all the Frauds and Sophisms of its Defenders.

Now since Mr. *Whiston* makes bold with Expositors in this manner, and takes upon him to charge them with pernicious Error in their Comments, even the Learnedest of 'em all, one would think it were wondrous plain, that they have indeed been grievously mistaken in that Notion of the Prophecies which he so scornfully rejects ; though suppose it were plainly Error in them, I do not see how it could altogether justify his using them no better. But alas ! His rough Treatment of those Worthies is without Cause at all ; For their Interpretations of several Prophecies of the *Messias*, as not belonging to him only, are sound and true ; and he is certainly in the wrong, as I am persuaded will be made evidently to appear in the following Discourse ; which shall be in this Method.

1. I shall demonstrate that there are some Prophecies of the *Messias*, which carry a double Sense with them.

2. I shall shew how that it is best and fittest, that there should be Prophecies of the *Messias* of that Sort, besides the Prophecies of the other Kind, and shall consider Mr. *Whiston's* Objections to the contrary. And,

Some Prophecies of the Messias.

5

3. I shall Examine and Answer his other Arguments, against all Double-Sense in Prophecy, which he calls *Demonstrations*.

1. I shall demonstrate, that there are Prophecies of the *Messias*, which are meant not of him only. But before I enter upon that part of my Business, I think fit to premise distinct Collections of the Prophecies of both kinds. Mr. *Whiston* argues, That this Double-Sense and Interpretation of the Ancient Prophecies, is pernicious to the Scripture-proofs of our Christian Faith; and that the Allowance of Double-Senses and Typical Applications, have been very unhappy things to the Christian Religion, and to the Proofs for the same, taken out of the Sacred Books of the Old Testament. How so? He seems to speak as our Modern Expositors interpreted all the Prophecies of the *Messias* to be Doubtful, by applying all of them *Secondarily*, and *Typically* to our Lord, after they had been in their first and primary Intention, already plainly fulfilled in the Times of the Old Testament. And so likewise *Eubulus*, in his conference with *Sophronius* about Mr. *Whiston's* Eight Sermons, observes to *Sophronius*, in answer to his suggesting a certain thing to him; *What you say, seems in some measure to justify Mr. Whiston in the Charge, the very heavy Charge, he brings against those Expositors, who make the Prophecies of the Old Testament*

p. 29.
p. 128.
p. 16.
Censura,
Numb. 1.
p. 19.

Testament to relate but in a Secondary Sense to the Messias, and the Times of his Kingdom which, I think, he has proved to be in the General a very false and disadvantageous way of Construction. This is but carelessly said : For certainly there are no Expositors, who make all the Prophecies of the Old Testament to relate but in a Secondary Sense to the Messias and the Times of his Kingdom ; because it is well known, that some Prophecies in the Old Testament do not relate to the Messias at all. *Eubulus's* Meaning must be, that there are Expositors who make the Prophecies of the Messias in the Old Testament, to relate but in a Secondary Sense to him, and to the Times of his Kingdom. But are there any Expositors that *Eubulus* knows of, who make all the Prophecies of the Messias in the Old Testament, to relate but in a Secondary Sense to him, and to the Times of his Kingdom ? No such Matter. There are sundry Prophecies of the Messias confessedly belonging to none but him ; how then the taking other of the Prophecies of him in a Double Sense, *pernicious to the Scriptures Proofs of our Common Christianity* in the Prophecies, which are acknowledg'd, and held on all Hands to be meant only of him. Mr. *Whiston* is hugely Zealous against the Double-Sense in Prophecies, as if the Cause of Christianity was lying at Stake ; that is, as if that way of Interpreting any of the Prophecies

Prop
or a
Jews
Messia
Script
posi
ones a
of Pro
to add
Testim
hereaft

prop
the
mea

N thee
Bless

The Sce
a Law-
loh come
the Peop

Some Prophecies of the Messias.

7

Prophecies endanger'd our Common Faith, or at least hindred the Conversion of the Jews : Whereas the single Prophecies of the Messias are so many, that they are sufficient Scripture-Proofs of our Christian Faith, supposing there had been none of the Double ones at all ; though indeed these latter sort of Prophecies, intermix'd with the other, do add a more abundant Strength to the Testimony of Prophecy, as I shall observe hereafter.

Prophecies of the *Messias* of the Single Sort, which were meant of none but Him.

GENESIS XII. 3.

In thee shall all Families of the Earth be Blessed.

Most Prophecies of the *Messias* meant of him singly.

CHAP. XLIX. 10.

The Sceptre shall not depart from Judah, a Law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come, and unto him shall the gathering of the People be.

F 2

DEU.

DEUTERONOMY XVIII. 15.

The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy Brethren like unto me ; unto him ye shall hearken.

PSALM II. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.

I will declare the Decree ; the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee: Ask of me, and I shall give thee the Heathen for thine Inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the Earth for thy Possession: Thou shalt bruise them with a rod of Iron: Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a Potter's Vessel. Be wise now therefore, O ye Kings: be instructed, ye Judges of the Earth ; serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little ; Blessed are all they, that put their Trust in him.

PSALM XVI. 10.

Thou wilt not suffer thine Holy One to see Corruption.

PSALM XXII. 16, 18.

They pierced my Hands and my Feet ; —

Some Prophecies of the Messias.

9

*part my Garments among them, and cast Lots
upon my Vesture.*

PSALM LXVIII. 18.

*Thou hast ascended on high : Thou hast led
Captivity Captive : Thou hast received Gifts
for Men.*

PSALM LXIX. 21.

*They gave me Gall for my Meat, and in my
Thirst they gave me Vinegar to Drink.*

The whole CXth PSALM.

*The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at
my right hand, until I make thine Enemies
thy Footstool ; The Lord shall send the Rod of
thy Strength out of Zion, &c.*

ISAIAH IX. 2, 6, 7.

*The People that walked in Darkness have
seen a great Light ; they that dwell in the
Land of the Shadow of Death, upon them hath
the Light shined : For unto us a Child is born,
unto us a Son is given, and the Government
shall be upon his Shoulder, and his Name shall
be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty
God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of
Peace ; Of the increase of his Government*

and Peace there shall be no end; upon the Throne of David, and upon his Kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with Judgment and with Justice, from henceforth even for ever: The Zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this.

CHAP. XI. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

And there shall come forth a Rod out of the Stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his Roots, and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him; the Spirit of Wisdom and Understanding, the Spirit of Counsel and Might, the Spirit of Knowledge, and of the Fear of the Lord: And shall make him of quick Understanding in the Fear of the Lord. And he shall not judge after the sight of his Eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his Ears, but with Righteousness shall he judge the Poor, and reprove with Equity, for the Meek of the Earth; and he shall smite the Earth with the Rod of his Mouth, and with the Breath of his Lips shall he slay the wicked: And Righteousness shall be the Girdle of his Loins, and Faithfulness the Girdle of his Reins.

CHAP. XXXV. 4, 5, 6.

Say unto them that are of a fearful Heart, Be strong, fear not; Behold, your God will come with Vengeance, even God with a Revenge.

Some Prophecies of the Messias.

11

pence ; he will come and save you. Then the Eyes of the Blind shall be opened, and the Ears of the Deaf shall be unstopped : Then shall the Lame Man leap as an Hart, and the Tongue of the Dumb shall sing.

CHAP. XL. 3, 4, 5.

The Voice of him that cryeth in the Wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the Desert an high way for our God ; Every Valley shall be exalted, and every Mountain and Hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough Places plain, and the Glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all Flesh shall see it together.

CHAP. XLII. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

Behold my Servant whom I uphold, mine Elect in whom my Soul delighteth ; I have put my Spirit upon him, he shall bring forth Judgment to the Gentiles : He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his Voice to be heard in the Street ; A bruised Reed shall he not break, and the smoking Flax shall he not quench ; he shall bring forth Judgment unto Truth : He shall not fail, nor be discouraged, till he have set Judgment in the Earth, and the Isles shall wait for his Law. Thus saith God the Lord, he that created the Heavens, and stretch-

ed them out, he that spread forth the Earth, and that which cometh out of it, he that giveth Breath unto the People upon it, and Spirit to them that walk therein; I the Lord have called thee in Righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a Covenant of the People; for a Light of the Gentiles, to open the Blind Eyes, to bring out the Prisoners out of Prison, and them that sit in Darkness from the Prison-House,

The whole LIId. Chapter.

Who hath believed our Report, and to whom is the Arm of the Lord revealed? For he shall grow up before him as a tender Plant, and as a Root out of a dry Ground; he hath no Form, nor Comeliness, &c.

DANIEL IX. 25, 26.

Know ye therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the Commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto Messiah the Prince shall be seven Weeks; and threescore and two Weeks the Street shall be built again, and the Wall even in troublous times; And after threescore and two Weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself.

JOËL II. 28, 29.

And it shall come to pass afterwards, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all Flesh, and your sons and your Daughters shall prophesy; your old Men shall dream Dreams, your Young Men shall see Visions: And also upon the Servants, and upon the Hand-maids in those days will I pour out my Spirit.

MICAH V. 2.

But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be our Ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.

HAGGAI II. 7, 8, 9.

And I will shake all Nations, and the Desire of all Nations shall come, and I will fill this House with Glory, saith the Lord of Hosts: The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of Hosts: The glory of this latter House shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of Hosts, and in this place will I give Peace, saith the Lord of Hosts.

ZECHARIAH IX. 9, 10.

Rejoice greatly, O Daughter of Zion; show
 O Daughter of Jerusalem; Behold, thy King
 cometh unto thee: He is just, and having sa-
 vation, lowly, and riding upon an Ass, and
 upon a Colt, the Foal of an Ass. And I will
 cut off the Chariot from Ephraim; and the
 Horse from Jerusalem, and the Battel-Breast
 shall be cut off, and he shall speak Peace to the
 Heathen, and his Dominion shall be from the
 river even to sea, and from the river even to the
 ends of the earth.

CHAP. XI. 12, 13.

And I said unto them, If ye think good
 give me my Price, and if not, forbear; so they
 weighed for my Price thirty pieces of Silver.
 And the Lord said unto me, Cast it unto the
 Potter; a goodly price, that I was prized at
 them: And I took the thirty pieces of Silver
 and cast them to the Potter in the House of
 the Lord.

CHAP. XII. 10.

And I will pour upon the House of David, and upon the Inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of Grace and Supplication, and they shall look upon me, whom they have pierced.

CHAP. XIII. 1, 7.

In that Day there shall be a Fountain opened to the House of David, and to the Inhabitants of Jerusalem for Sin, and for Uncleanesses. Awake, O Sword, against my Shepherd, and against the Man that is my Fellow, saith the Lord of Hosts : Smite the Shepherd, and the Sheep shall be scattered.

MALACHI III. 1.

The Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his Temple, even the Messenger of the Covenant whom ye delight in ; behold he shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts.

CHAP. IV. 2.

But unto you that fear my Name, shall the Son of Righteousness arise with healing in his wings.

These

These are * Prophecies of the *Messias*, belonging only to him ; and there are but few Christian Interpreters that expound any of them otherwise ; and there is no need of shewing, that such Prophecies as these have but a Single Sense. I do not here pretend to have given a Compleat List of the Single-sensed Prophecies, this is not my present Business ; my Meaning only is, to put so many of them together, as may be sufficient for shewing, that the greatest part of the Prophecies of the *Messias* are Single. Whence we may see what little cause there is, for Mr. *Whiston's* exclaiming in his Book with such Heat against the Interpreters of Prophecies in a Double Sense ; as if the allowing of any such Prophecies so mightily weak'ned the Proofs of the Truth of Christianity from Prophecy ; for the Prophecies of that sort are few in comparison of the

* Mr. *Samuel White*, in his Commentary on the Prophecy of *Isaiah*, doth, after *Grotius's* Way, expound some of *Isaiah's* Prophecies in this Collection, as not belonging only to the *Messias* : For he interprets the 2d, 6th and 7th Verses of the 9th Chapter and the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th & 5th of the 11th Chapter, to be meant of *Hezekiah* also ; and the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th 5th 6th & 7th Verses of the 42d Chapter, as meant of *Cyrus* too ; and he thinks that the 3d, 4th and 5th Verses of the 40th Chapter may be understood of the Return from *Babylon* : But his Reasons for so expounding those Prophecies are no way satisfactory, and I think, he greatly errs in his Comments on them.

Some Prophecies of the Messias.

17

ther. Wherefore I readily agree with Mr. *Whiston* thus far, That much the greatest ^{P. 48.} part of those Prophecies which are alledged by the Evangelists, are plainly and certainly meant of the Messias, and could be true of none but him: Thus, says he, the 18th of Deu- ^{P. 49.} teronomy; the 2d, and the 16th, and the 22d, and 110th, and 118th Psalms; the 53d of *Isaiah*; the 9th Chapter of *Daniel*; the 2d of *Joel*; the 9th of *Amos*; the 5th of *Micah*; the 9th, 11th, and 13th of *Zachary*; and the 3d and 4th of *Malachi*, are the Places of the Old Testament, from whence most of the Citations of the Evangelists are taken. Very right: Only I do not like what he insinuates, Which to an Impartial Eye do so plainly appertain to the Messias, that one would wonder that any of the Moderns should once think of expounding any of them otherwise: For this is an unfair and scurvy Reflection, as if the Moderns expounded all, or most of those Citations otherwise, and will never allow him to be originally and properly foretold, but ^{P. 38.} where with all their Skill and Art they cannot possibly apply the Description to any other. Whereas most of the Prophecies so cited, the Moderns do expound no otherwise, than as appertaining only to the Messias. But there are some Prophecies of the Messias they have expounded not to be meant solely of him, whose Expositions Mr. *Whiston*'s Single Authority is not sufficient to discountenance; nor

nor do any of the Reasonings in his Book overthrow; but such their Comments hold still the same, very warrantable, right and true, notwithstanding all the Stir he makes to have us think otherwise of them.

Prophecies of the *Messias*, that were not meant only of Him.

NUMBERS XXIV. 17.

The Propheticke
Stile not
always
Single.

I Shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh: There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the Corners of Moab, and destroy all the Children of Seth.

P S A L. II. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

Why do the Heathen rage, and the People imagine a vain thing? The Kings of the Earth set themselves, and the Rulers take counsel together against the Lord, and against his Anointed; saying, Let us break their Bands asunder, and cast away their Cords from us. He that sitteth in the Heavens shall laugh; the

Lord

some Prophecies of the Messias.

19

Lord shall have them in derision : Then shall
he speak unto them in his Wrath, and vex them
in his sore Displeasure. Tet have I set my King
upon my Holy Hill of Zion.

P S A L. CXVIII. 22.

*The Stone which the Builders refused, is be-
come the head-Stone of the Corner.*

P S A L. VIII. 2.

*Out of the Mouth of Babes and Sucklings
thou ordained strength, because of thine
enemies, that thou mightest still the Enemy,
and the Avenger.*

P S A L. XXI. 4, 5, 6.

*He asked Life of thee, and thou gavest it
him, even length of days for ever and ever.
His glory is great in thy salvation, honour and
majesty hast thou laid upon him, for thou hast
made him most blessed for ever; thou hast
made him exceeding glad with thy Counte-*

2 S A M. VII. 14.

I will be his Father, and he shall be my

P S A L.

P S A L. LXXII. 1, 2, 3.

Give the King thy Judgments, O God, and thy Righteousness unto the King's Son. He shall judge thy People with Righteousness, and thy Poor with Judgment. The Mountains shall bring Peace to the People, and the little Hills by Righteousness, &c.

I S A I A H VII. 14, 15, 16.

Therefore the Lord himself shall give you sign; Behold, a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call his Name Immanuel. Butter and Honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good. For before the Child shall know to refuse the Evil, and choose the Good, the Land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her Kings.

C H A P. LXI. 1, 2.

The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good Tidings unto the Meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the Captives, and the opening of the Prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable Year of the Lord.

HOSEA XI. 1.

*When Israel was a Child, then I loved him,
and called my Son out of Egypt.*

PSAL. VIII. 6.

Thou hast put all things under his feet.

And now I shall shew clearly, that these prophecies of the *Messias* have a Double sense, not being meant solely of the *Messias*: And I have placed the Double-sensed prophecies of the *Messias* in this Order, for Method's sake, and to distinguish them the better; for in some of these Prophecies (and they are the most) the *Messias* is joined with Single Persons; in one of them he is joined with a whole Nation or People; in another, with all Mankind.

I shall begin with those Prophecies of the *Messias*, in which he is joined with Single Persons: And there are Four Persons he is joined with in Prophecy, viz. *David*, *Solomon*, and *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*, and *Isaiah*.

1. *David*: And the *Messias* is joined most with him, being both his Father, and also Eminent Type of him.

Balaam's
Prophecy,
Numb. 24.
17. ex-
plained.

The First Prophecy of the *Messias*, in conjunction with *David*, is *Balaam's* Famous Prophecy, Numb. 24. 17. *I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh; there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the Corners of Moab, and destroy all the Children of Sheth.* Jews and Christians do agree that this Passage is a Prophecy of the *Messias*, and that it is a clear Prophecy of *David*, and speaks of him too, is confessed by some of both: The *Star* meant that should come out of *Jacob*, and the *Sceptre* that should rise out of *Israel*; as likewise he that should come out of *Jacob*, who should have *Dominion*, as in the 19th Verse, was first *David*, and afterwards the *Messias*, the Son of *David*: And accordingly in this one and the same Prophecy, here is a Double Event foretold, a nearer and a more remote: Which Two Different Events are distinctly mention'd in the latter Words of the Prophecy: For the nearer Event foretold, which yet was *not nigh*, being for Hundreds of Years off, was, that the *Star* and *Sceptre* arising out of *Israel*, should smite the *Corners of Moab*; the more remote Event was, that he should *destroy* (or rather, as Bishop *Patrick* well observes, it is better render'd, should exercise Rule over) all the *Children of Seth*: Now the former Particular foretold, the smiting of *Moab*, is to be attributed

Some Prophecies of the Messias.

23

attributed to *David*, in whom it was so notably fulfilled, 2 *Sam.* 8. 2. *Psal.* 60. 8. and 108. 9. The latter to the *Messias*, who was to have the Power and Dominion given him, not only over the *Israelites*, but over all Mankind : For Universal Dominion did not belong to the *Star* and *Sceptre*, as meant of *David*; nor Victory over *Moab* in particular, to the *Star* and *Sceptre*, as meant of Christ.

But to make this Point clearer still, we are to observe, that before *Balaam* had finished his Parables, and left *Balak*, God mov'd him to prophesy of Christ, that thereby he might suggest the Reason why God would by no means suffer him to curse and defy *Israel* : Says he, *There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel* : That is, The *Israelites* were God's Peculiar Chosen People, and blessed above all the World, because he had determined the great *Messias* should descend from their Rock and Nation. Now therefore *Balaam*, instead of cursing the *Israelites*, that the *Moabites* might discomfit them, as *Balak* would fain have had him, prophesy'd Evil against *Moab*, in the Reign of a certain King of *Israel*; and at the same time being directed by the Prophetick Spirit, gave forth all the Reason why the *Israelites* were by no means to be cursed, and he could prophesy better things concerning *Moab*, viz. Be-

cause the *Israelites* were the Blessed People of whom the *Messias* should come. Here then in *Balaam's* Prophecy of the *Messias*, as there was another Person meant besides him, so withal the Reason of the Double-Sense seems manifest. The *Star* and *Sceptre* was ultimately and chiefly the *Messias*, but was to be somebody else first : That is to say, There should arise a Victorious King of *Israel*, that should entirely subdue the *Moabites* to make them subject to the *Israelites* : For why ? They must needs be a Nation superior to *Moab*, the *Israelites* being a People peculiarly respected, favoured and honour'd for that very Reason because out of them at length the most illustrious Governor was to come, even the *Messias* himself, the *Star* and *Sceptre*; in which *David* the Conqueror of *Moab* was but a Type, and in whom the Prophecy should be far more eminently fulfill'd. That I take to be a full and clear Explication of *Balaam's* Prophecy of the *Messias*, where instead of cursing the *Israelites*, that they might be over-run by the *Moabites*, he prophesied Ruin to the *Moabites* from a Prince of *Israel*.

Mr. WHISTON;
Gloss on
Numb. 24.
17. refused.

But Mr. *Whiston* interprets this *Noah's* and *Ancient Prediction* (being his Sixteenth Prophecy) quite another way; and very odd Work he makes with it, to avoid the Double-Sense. He is so far from allowing

David

David to be with the *Messias* in the Prophecy, that he will not have the *Messias* himself to be the Subject of it, nor thinks it was meant to be fulfill'd in him as yet: That is, he makes it a Prediction of his Second Coming to Judgment at the Great Resurrection. For he says, *Who can that Person be that Balaam himself expected to see, and to behold a long time after he was dead, but that great Redeemer, whom Job also expected to see out of his own Flesh at the end of the World?* And he begins his Paraphrase on the Place thus; *I shall see, says the Prophet, that Great and Divine Person, whom God will send to be the Saviour and Patron of Israel, the Messias, but not till the latter end of the World.* And again, *Balaam will certainly see and behold the Messias, the Judge of the World, at the Last Day.* This is such an Exposition of *Balaam's* Prophecy, as I profess never to have met with before; and I think here Mr. *Whiston* is alone, and differs from all Expositors: It seems from the meer Sound of those Words, *I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh;* he makes *Balaam* to foretel what he himself should see hereafter, to wit, at Christ's Second Coming, and the General Resurrection; which is another of his Mistakes. The Future Tense is often used for the Present, as Bishop *Patrick* upon the Place would have us observe;

observe ; and so it is in *Balaam's* Prophecy, as is evident from the Context. The Sense of the Prophecy plainly is ; I do see him, but not now, as in being at present ; I do behold him, but he is not nigh ; For *Balaam* did not foretel what he himself should one day see with *Job*, when he should be risen from the Dead, but he foretold what should be in remote Ages, from what he saw represented even now : He prophesy'd of distant Things from present Vision ; *He hath said, which heard the Words of God, and knew the Knowledge of the most High ; which saw the Vision of the Almighty, falling into a Trance, but having his Eyes open.* And in that *Vision of the Almighty* he saw *David* and the *Messias*, though neither of them were yet in the World, nor should be for a long time.

And there are Two Things more in *Mr. Whiston's* Exposition of this Prophecy which are faulty : One is, He carelessly confounds the Phrases of *Last Days*, *Days of the Messias*, and the concluding Age, with the Phrases of the *Latter End of the World*, *End of the World*, and *Last Day* ; as if they were not distinct, but the same, and signified one and the same thing ; so that one can hardly guess his Time when *Balaam's* Prophecy should be fulfill'd : For in one part of his Exposition you would think he meant it was to be fulfilled in the Days of the Messias

as, or *Concluding Age of the World*; elsewhere, that it was to be fulfill'd at the *Last Day*, or when there should actually be an end of the World. Neither can any Man living make Sense of so Dark an Interpretation, or reconcile the Expositor to himself; unless, peradventure, we may help him a little, by distinguishing for him, and so take his Meaning to be this; That *Balaam's* supposed Prophecy concerning his own seeing the *Messias*, *I shall see him, but not now, I shall behold him, but not nigh*; was not to be fulfilled till the End of the World, and the Resurrection. But his Prophecy concerning the Coming of the *Messias*, *There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel*, was to be fulfilled long before. The other thing in his Comment on *Balaam's* Prophecy of Christ, which I marvel at not a little, is his telling us, That the Universal Dominion of Christ over the *Jews*, and over all the States and Polities of the World, commences at the End of the World: For in his Paraphrase he says, *At the last of all, in the End of the World*, the utter Destruction of the *Roman Empire with its Metropolis*, and surely the Dissolution of all other Earthly Government, shall make way for the *Universal Dominion of the King of the Jews*; and so no Kingdom in the World shall be able to hinder the Spreading, or to oppose the Au-

P. 218.

thority of this great Kingdom of the Jews, or of the Messias, the Everlasting King of that Nation: That is to say, When this World shall be no more, then will Christ exercise an Universal Dominion over the Jews and the World; when Christ shall have put down all Rule, and all Authority and Power, All Political Laws and Constitutions whatsoever; then none of the Kingdoms of this World in being shall be able to hinder the spreading, or to oppose the Authority of this great Kingdom of the Jews. And when all National Societies shall utterly fail, and for ever cease amongst Men, and so there shall be no Nation of the Jews neither; then shall the Messias begin to be the Everlasting King of that Nation. What stuff is this! And yet notwithstanding these Absurdities and Repugnances, still he doubts not to say at the end of his long Paraphrase, *This appears to me to be the most Genuine Sense of this Famous Prophecy.* But of a Double-Sense he will by no means admit; for he asserts, that the Prophecy contains *distinguishing Characters of the Person and Times of the Messias, which without great force and violence cannot be expounded of any other.* He owns that David subdued the Moabites; and that a man of Wit, not of Judgment, may make shift to interpret some other parts of the Prophecy, of such a smaller and prior Event: But then he disparages this kind of Exposition as more

P. 218,
219.

P. 216.

P. 217.

June a
with
elsewhe
appear
adds)
of the J
false: i
mentat
David a
ent Inte
shall l
to shew
son's T

* I obser
ly recom
interpreting
ur being i
ble and D
unkilfulness
the poor
requently gi
7, 254.
that this
says we
opening
book of Go
found in
livering t
d Expressi
lliar to the
ey speak a
on, on pur
those A
d understo
nce the T
om their A
nce the Scri
ve none be

une and little; it doth not sute, says he,
with * *Prophetick Language, and Contents*
elsewhere: Yes, very well; and nothing
appears to the contrary; nor agrees (as he
adds) with the most Ancient Interpretations
of the Jewish and Christian Church. That is
false: *Maimonides*, the chief Jewish Com-
mentator, divided the Prophecy between
David and the *Messias*; and as to the Anci-
ent Interpretations of the Christian Church,
I shall have occasion, before I have done,
to shew, that they are not for Mr. *Whi-*
ston's Turn.

Bishop Pa-
trick's
Comment
on the
Place.

Another

* I observe, that here and there in his Book he mightily recommends the *Prophetick Language*, as a Rule of Interpreting the Prophets; and he insists on the necessity of our being in good measure Masters of that Peculiar, and truly Noble and Divine Dialect, p. 12. And he looks upon the Inskillfulness of Expositors in the Dialect, to be one great Reason of the poor and unsatisfactory Interpretations, which they so frequently give us of Prophecies of the greatest Importance, p. 83, 254. Now for my part, I cannot well tell what it is that this Man means by that *Prophetick Language*, which he says we ought to be well Versed in, as a necessary Key for opening to us the Minds of the Prophets: Does the Book of God so abound with Idioms never used, or to be found in any Human Book? Did not the Prophets in delivering their Inspirations, use Words, and Phrases, and Expressions like other Men? Had they a Dialect peculiar to themselves, different from all Mankind? Or did they speak and write out of the common way of Expression, on purpose that they might not be understood? Or are those Ancient Prophecies difficult to be interpreted and understood, by reason that Stile is so much altered since the Times of the Prophets, and at this distance from their Age? I will ask Mr. *Whiston* yet farther: Since the Scriptures of the Prophets have been written, have none been so happy, as to become in good measure Masters

Another Prophecy of the *Messias*, in which *David* is with him, is the beginning of the 2d. Psalm; *Why do the Heathen rage, and the People imagine a vain thing? The Kings of the Earth set themselves, and the Rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his Anointed, saying, Let us break their Bands asunder, and cast away their Cord from us: He that sitteth in the Heavens shall laugh, the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure; Yet have I set my King upon my holy Hill of Zion.* Which Double-sens'd Prophecy of the *Messias* differs from *Balaam's* in this Respect: That in *Balaam's* Prophecy of the *Messias*

sters of that Peculiar, and truly Noble and Divine Dialect, himself? Have none attained to this Knowledge by frequent reading of those Sacred Books, and comparing the several Expressions together, but he? If Skill in the Sacred Dialect be so very peculiar to Mr. *Whiston*, methinks, besides his Preparatory Observations, he ought to have prefaced his Book, and obliged the World with a Discourse at large concerning the Prophetick Language, to let us know what was the *Stile* then in use, when the Prophecies of their Periods began, p. 8. That so we might have before our Rule to interpret the Prophets by: But to refer ever and anon to the Language of the Prophets, as necessary to be known and observed by us, for our understanding the Prophets, and to reject this or that Exposition because it does not suite with Prophetick Language, without shewing us all the while, what that singular *Stile* and Dialect is he speaks of; is Bantering his Reader, as we call it; that is, seeming to say something, when he says nothing.

31

2 Sam.
7. 1.
c. 8, & 10.

Psalm, that either *David* spake this concerning himself, or his People were ordered to sing it of him with Joy and Triumph; who being raised from the Sheepfolds to a Throne, after he had been despised by his Parents and Brethren, and long opposed by *Saul* and his Court, and the Chief of the Kingdom, was also disdained and hated by the Kings of the Earth round about him; insomuch that they gathered themselves together to encompass and environ him; whom notwithstanding God preserved, and made a more Illustrious and Glorious Prince than any of 'em all: For not fearing the Expeditions of the Confederate Nations against him, he makes his Boast of God in this manner; *The Lord is on my side, I will not fear what Man can do unto me, v. 6. All Nations compassed me about, but in the Name of the Lord will I destroy them; They compassed me about, yet they compassed me about, but in the Name of the Lord I will destroy them. They compassed me about like Bees, they are quenched as the fire of the Thorns, for in the Name of the Lord I will destroy them: Thou hast threatened at me, that I might fall, but the Lord helped me, Verses 10, 11, 12, 13.* And after much Experience of God's Goodness to him in delivering him from his Enemies, he resolves to acknowledge it with Thankfulness; *I will praise thee, for thou hast helped me,*

Some Prophecies of the Messias.

33

me, and art become my Salvation, v. 21. And his Subjects were to bear a part in praising God for their renowned King, whom he had set above the Insolence of all his Enemies. *The Stone which the Builders refused, is become the head-Stone of the Corner: This is the Lord's doing: it is marvellous in our Eyes,* Verses 22, 23. But then this was not so much meant of *David*, as Prophecied of the *Messias* his Son, the Antitype, who should be refused, set at nought, and killed by the Great Ones of his time, by *Herod*, and *Pontius Pilate*, and the Chief-Priests and the Elders, and also by the Gentiles, and People of *Israel*; and yet after all should be raised from the Dead, and exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour.

Matth. 21.

42.
Luke 19.

14.
Acts 4-11.
& 5. 31.

So likewise again, as it appears to me, There is some respect to *David* in another Prophecy relating to the *Messias*; viz. *David's* notable Victory over the great *Goliath* of *Gath*, who was but an Infant or Suckling in comparison of that mighty Gyant, is referr'd to in a Prophecy, That the *Messias* should confound and vanquish the Devil, and all the Powers of Darkness. Out of the mouth of Babes and Sucklings hast thou obtained strength, because of thine Enemies, that thou mightest still the Enemy and the Anger. Mr. *Whiston* says, That this Verse contains such a Characteristick as determines it to the *Messias* only, and it cannot in any fair

Psal. 8. 2.

Con-

p. 50.

Construction have respect to David's Victory over Goliath, as some Commentators are willing to imagine. Indeed there is no Context in this *Psalms* shewing us, that the Prophecy of the Second Verse hath any reference to *David* too, as in the Prophecy preceding ; but without that Light, the Verse seems to be so explained by something else, which is almost Equivalent to a Context, and that is, the Title of the *Psalms*, *A Psalm of David delivered to the Master of Musick upon * Gittith* : For *Goliath* was a *Gittite*, as we read 1 *Chron.* 20. 5. which in the Opinion of some Interpreters implies, that the *Psalms* was composed soon after the Signal Overthrow of the haughty *Goliath* by *David* ; Others do conceive, that the Title is from a Circumstance relating to the City of *Gath*, the Place whereunto *Goliath* belonged ; that is, the *Psalms* was to be sung to a Musical Instrument made on purpose at *Gath* upon occasion of the Victory, and brought from thence by *David*, to be used in the Tabernacle : And if Commentators be not mistaken in the Title of the *Psalms*

* It is true the 81st and 84th *Psalms* bear the Title of *Gittith*, where *Goliath* cannot be supposed to be the Subject at all. But then this is to be said ; Probably the Title was affixed to those two other *Psalms*, only to signify that they were to be sung as *Gittith*, or the 8th *Psalms* and with no other meaning.

but do rightly expound it of *Goliath*, I should think Mr. *Whiston* will the more easily grant a Double-Sense in the Prophetick Verse now quoted; forasmuch as *David's* Victory over that insolent Gyant, was so very natural a Type and Emblem of the Victory of Christ and his Apostles over our powerful Adversary the Devil, according to Mr. *Mede's* Exposition of the Prophecy; *Out of the mouth of Babes and Sucklings hast thou ordained strength, because of thine Enemies, that thou mightest still the Enemy and the Avenger*; that is, God determined to magnify his own Divine Power in the use of small and inconsiderable Instruments, to bring about the greatest Purposes; insomuch that weak and frail Men, even such as are no better in their Original than poor helpless Babes and Sucklings, should with a Word speaking out of their Mouth, be able to beat down and subdue the Power of the great Enemies of Mankind, the Devil and his Angels.

Once more. In a certain *Psalms* of King *David* concerning himself, and the Felicity and Glory of his Reign, the Blessed *Messias* is prophetically and mystically described, even in the Person of the Illustrious *David*; to wit, in the 21st *Psalms*. The Honour, and Majesty, and Fulness of Days, which by the Divine Favour were vouchsafed to the King, spoken of in that *Psalms*, were no doubt *David's* Blessedness in a great measure

sure and degree ; but we cannot readily suppose that all that he says in the *Psalm*, while he seems to be describing his own happy State only, was really meant to be true of himself, according to the utmost of so lofty a Description of Bliss and Happiness, as he gives there : But the height of the Character rather belongs to the *Messias*, and points to him. It is most certain, that God granted to *David* Length of Life, and Honour and Glory, and a Posterity to fill his Throne after him ; but yet in recounting and acknowledging these Blessings from God, one would think he did not speak of himself only, but was carried forth by the Divine Spirit, to speak of a Greater than himself, when he used those Magnificent Expressions ; *He asked Life of thee, and thou gavest it him, even length of Days for ever and ever ; His Glory is great in thy Salvation ; Honour and Majesty hast thou laid upon him, for thou hast made him most Blessed for ever, Verses 4, 5, 6.*

The Second Person with whom the *Messias* is joined in Prophecy, is *Solomon* ; and there are two Places in which the *Messias* is manifestly joined with him. There is that Conjunction in the Prophecy of the *Messias*, quoted *Heb. i. 5. I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son* : As also in the 72d. *Psalm, Give the King thy Judgments, O God, and thy Righteousness unto the King*

King's Son ; He shall judge thy People with Righteousness, and thy Poor with Judgment ; The Mountains shall bring Peace to the People, and the little Hills, by Righteousness, &c.

1. In the Prophetick Promise, *I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son :* for this Scripture the Apostle to the Hebrews applies to the Messias, as a Prophecy of him ; and I will shew, that it was meant so of Solomon, and belonged to him too : which Mr. Whiston is pleas'd to deny, and will have *this Famous Prophecy to belong only to the Messias himself, without any regard to Solomon ;* and to prove his Point, he hath taken great pains, and filled almost twenty Pages in his Book ; but alas ! to no purpose in the Earth ; neither can his long reasoning on the Prophecy satisfy his Reader at all. This Passage in the first Chapter of the Hebrews we are upon, is not quoted from a single Text, but from several places in the Old Testament ; viz. from 2 Sam. 7. 1 Chron. 17. 12, 13. and 22. 9, 10. 28. 5, 6, 7. in which it is repeated : and as we find in those Four Chapters, it shews in where the Subject of Discourse is a Prediction or Promise to David, that in length an House should be built for God to dwell in, and he would walk no longer in a Tent, and in a Tabernacle : For that House should be built for God, was twice said to David ; the first time by Nathan the King.

Solomon's
joined with
the Mes-
sias in
2 Sam. 7.
14.

P. 267.

Appendix,
22d Prophe-
cy, P. 247.

² Sam. 7. *than* the Prophet, the second time immediately to himself. The Occasion of the first
^{4, 17.}
¹ Chron. ^{22.} 8. Prediction by *Nathan*, was *David's* having
² Sam. 7. 3. it in his Heart to build an House for God;
 for *David* had brought the Ark from Kir-
 jath-jearim, and then from the House of O-
 bed-Edom, and had set it in a Tent or Ta-
 bernacle made with Curtains, in the Hill of
 Zion, and had before that also built himself
 an House of Cedar : *David* therefore in a lit-
 tle time reflected upon this, as a piece of great
 Indecency in him, to live in great Pomp and
 State in a Palace of Cedar of his own, while
 he permitted the Ark of God, the Place of the
 Divine Shechinah, to remain in a poor Tent
 made with Curtains : Upon this Occasion, *Da-*
vid purposed within himself to build a magni-
 ficent and sumptuous Temple for the Ark of God

The Occasion of the second Revela-
 tion of the thing made immediately to *Da-*
² Sam. 7. *vid*, was God's Will that *David* should know
^{5, 13.} why he was not to build the House as *W*
 told him, and the particular Reason of his
 unfitness for that Work ; which was his
¹ Chron. *many Wars, and his shedding so much Blood in*
^{22.} 8. *Reign* : And so the first Prediction of the
 Temple was delivered soon after *David* was
 made King over all Israel, and before his
 many Wars, long before the Birth of *Solomon*
 the second, nearer the conclusion of his *Reign*
 after they were over, a little before *Solomon's*
 Birth. Now Mr. Whiston, to shew the

the Prophetick Scripture, *Heb. 1. 15.* could not agree, or belong to *Solomon*, and was not meant of him at all, quotes *2 Sam. 7.* even the whole Chapter, from the beginning to the end, except part of the *14th* Verse; noting at the end of the Chapter, *If this be not a Prophecy concerning the Messias, and his Everlasting Kingdom, I do not know where to find any such in all the Old Testament:* Is the whole Chapter a Prophecy concerning the Messias, and his Everlasting Kingdom, else no such Prophecy is to be found in all the Old Testament? Surely, in all that Chapter quoted by him at full length, nothing belongs to the *Messias* but what is contained in the Four middle Verses, the *13th, 14th, 15th, and 16th*; where he is spoken of in the Person of *Solomon*, and as Typified by him. In which Typical Texts, there are two prophecies concerning the *Messias*; One of them is a Prediction of the Dearness of the *Messias* to God, the other of the Duration of his Kingdom. The former Prophecy is in these Words, *I will be his Father, and he shall be my Son.* When *Solomon* was born, the Lord loved him; so when *Jesus* was Baptized, God testified concerning him a Voice from Heaven, *This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased:* And one of the Characters of *Jesus*, is the Beloved. The other Prophecy is in these Words, *If Solomon commit Iniquity, I will chasten him*

P. 249,
250, 251,
252.

2 Sam. 12.

24.

Matth. 3.

17.

Ephes. 1.

6.

with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men; but my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee; And thine House, and thy Kingdom shall be established for ever before thee; thy Throne shall be established for ever. Here, tho' God threatned concerning Solomon, that if he committed Iniquity, he would indeed chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men, yet he promised withal, that his Mercy should not depart away from him, as he took it from Saul; and the same thing he promised to other of

Pfalm 89.

30, 31, 32,
33.

David's Seed after him, as well as to Solomon: Which Promise was made good in a mixture of Mercy with Judgment, at the Division of the Tribes, when *Solomon's* Idolatry was not punished, as *Saul's* Disobedience had been before, with the loss of all the Tribes: But nevertheless one Tribe was given to *Rehoboam*, *Solomon's* Son, and continued to his Successors in *David's* Line.

Now the promised Establishment of *David's* Throne for ever, even tho' *Solomon*, or any other of his Children should commit Iniquity, no doubt withal respected the *Messias*, and was meant chiefly of his absolute Establishment at last on that Throne, who should commit no Iniquity at all: For this was Prophecy, That as a Succession of Princes from *David* should never fail in the Kingdom of *Judah* to the coming of the *Messias*, so also that when the *Messias* himself was

com

* Jesus
of the Kin
her Succ
for, as for
y, none of
eeding Ge
he Throne
whom it w
or ever. S
ealogies t
ne *Messias* w
ne Throne
verlasting
ersion of t
Dissolution
ineal Desce
his time, m
er any ne
whom they
em to prov
that he is

come to that Crown; who should have none to succeed on the Throne of *David* after him, he should reign over the House of *Ja-* Luke 1.
cob for ever. Thus God's Promise concer- 33.
ning *Solomon* in particular, that his Mercy should not depart away from him, as he took it from *Saul*, but he should be only Cha-
stened in case of Iniquity, was meant to fore-
show, that nothing should hinder the constant Succession of the Royal Family of *David* in *Judah*, to the Times of the *Messias*; and consequently that Promise must be sup-
posed to be Mystical with respect to the *Messias* himself, *Jesus Christ the Righteous* *, the last in the Succession from *David*, even

* *Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews*, was the last of the Kings in the Royal Line from *David*, and so all farther Succession in that Line ceased and ended in him: for, as for them that were a-kin to *Jesus* in *David's* Family, none of them, or of their Posterities after them in succeeding Generations, could have any Right to Reign on the Throne of *David*, after He sat upon that Throne, to whom it was given, that he might fill it, and Rule on it for ever. So then there was no farther Occasion for Genealogies to preserve the Succession from *David*, when the *Messias* was once come, after whom none should sit on the Throne of *David*, because the *Messias* was to be the everlasting King on that Throne. Accordingly in a Dissolution of the *Jews* for Seventeen Centuries, after so long a Duration of their Government, All Genealogies of a lineal Descent in *David's* Family from Age to Age, to this time, must needs have fail'd; insomuch, that whenever any new False Christ, or Counterfeit *Messias* arises, whom they shall follow, it will be next to impossible for them to prove his Descent from *David* in the Royal Line, that he is *David's* Son.

A Double Sense in

to signify, that most certainly of his Kingdom on the *Throne of his Father David*, there should be *no end*. All the while we see plainly, that the Promise, *I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son*, must be meant of *Solomon*, because the Person of whom this was spoken, was threatened to be Chastened, if he committed Iniquity; and the Threatning immediately follows the Promise, *I will be his Father, and he shall be my Son: If he commit Iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men*, v. 14. And can these Words belong to the Blessed *Messias*, who did no sin, neither was guilt found in his mouth, and who was a Lamb without blemish, and without spot? No certainly. The *Messias* could never commit Iniquity, and so could never thereby deserve to be chastised with the rod of men, or with the stripes of the children of men, as Mr. *Whiston* argues and very well.

p. 256.

2 Sam. 7.
14. not
corrupted.

p. 259.

But then which way goes he to work still notwithstanding, to maintain his Point, that the Promise, *I will be his Father, &c.* was not meant of *Solomon*, but was only a Prophecy of the *Messias*? One would be something amazed: He makes no Scruple to charge our present Copies in *Samuel* with Corruption; For he says, That if the Prophecy, as it was originally delivered, contained these Words, as they now stand in our present

Copies

Copies
will
Men
than
leave
was no
And
that
commi
rod of
Why,
entirely
those
Iniqui
of tha
Confid
over J
Wars
time;
vid's A
son;
Famin
tion;
Abiath
Solomon
rical P
el, and
entirely
we cor
which
Chroni
tirely o

Copies, viz. **If he commit Iniquity, I will chasten him with the Rod of Men, &c.** it could not belong to any other than Solomon. But then you must give me leave to say, that I am well assured, that this was not in the Primitive Reading of this Text. And what should make him so very sure, that those Words in 2 Sam. 7. 14. *If he commit Iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, &c.* are a Corruption there? Why, the Parallel Chapter in the Chronicles entirely omits the whole Passage; Therefore those Words in 2 Sam. 7. 14. *If he commit Iniquity, &c.* are not the Primitive Reading of that Text. An admirable Reason for his Confidence in this Matter! *David's* Reign over *Judah* in *Hebron* for Seven Years; the Wars between his and *Saul's* House in that time; the Murther of King *Ishbosheth*; *David's* Adultery and Murther; *Abshalom's* Treason; *Sheba's* Rebellion; the Three Years Famine in *David's* time; *Adonijah's* Usurpation; His and *Joab's*, and *Shimei's* Excision; *Abiathar's* Deposition from the Priesthood; *Solomon's* Idolatry, and divers other Historical Passages in the Second Book of *Samuel*, and in the Two Books of the *Kings*, are entirely omitted in the *Chronicles*. And if we compare Places in *Samuel* and the *Kings*, which are exactly parallel to Places in the *Chronicles*, we shall find several Matters entirely omitted in the *Chronicles*, which were

recorded before : For Instance, *David's Rest* round about from all his Enemies, mentioned in the first Verse of this very Chapter, *2 Sam. 7.* is left out in the parallel place, *1 Chron. 17. 1.* So likewise *Michal's Barrenness until the Day of her Death*, for her reviling *David*, *2 Sam. 6. 23.* The two Harlots that came to King *Solomon* for Justice, *1 Kings 3. 16.* His Blessing and Exhorting the People, after his Prayer to God at the Dedication of the Temple, *1 Kings 8. 54, 55.* *Jeroboam's Calves at Bethel and Dan*, *1 Kings 13.* are left out in the parallel Histories, which we have in the *Chronicles*, *1 Chron. 15. 2 Chron. 1. 2 Chron. 6. 2 Chron. 10.* and the like : For other Places there are of the same sort, which we may find at our leisure, when we please to consult and compare those Histories. If therefore our not finding any Passage in the Books of the *Chronicles*, which was written in the Three Books foregoing, may be allowed to be a Sign that the said Passage was a Corruption in that History, and was never Primatively read there, as *Mr. Whiston* would have it ; then alas ! what abundance of Corruption is there in our present Copies of *Samuel* and the *Kings* ?

*2 Sam. 7.
14, and
Psal. 89.
26, 27.
not Paral-
lel Places.*

And truly his other Reason for being well assured that the Version in *2 Sam. 7. 14.* is a Corruption in our Copy, and ought to be corrected, is no less absurd and foolish, which

which is this : He says, That *the Psalmist* p. 256.

in that remarkable 89th Psalm directly repeats and paraphrases the chief parts of this very Prophecy, and did certainly read in his Copy quite otherwise than we do now in ours : To that Famous Psalm therefore do I appeal for the correction of this Text. For he supposes that the 89th *Psalm* is but a Repetition of *Sam. 7.* and a kind of Paraphrase upon the Chief Parts of it ; whereas it doth not appear that the *Psalm* is a Place parallel to the Chapter, nor can I see that the *Psalm* hath any reference thereunto at all ; so far is it from being a Paraphrase upon it, or upon any part thereof : For the main Subject of the Chapter in *Samuel* was the Revelation, that an House should be built for God ; but there is not one tittle in all the 89th *Psalm* about any such House. And then whereas Mr. *Whiston* says, that these Verses of the *Psalm*, viz. the 26th, and p. 258.
27th, *He shall cry unto me, thou art my Father, my God, and the Rock of my Salvation; And I will make him my First-born, higher than the Kings of the Earth,* are a Paraphrase upon this Passage in the Chapter, *I will be his Father, and he shall be my Son,* he is much mistaken : For those Words of the *Psalmist*, *He shall cry unto me, Thou art my Father, &c.* Also *I will make him my First-born, &c.* were spoken of *David*, who was not to build the House of God : But those Words in *Samuel,*

Samuel, I will be his Father, and he shall be my Son, were spoken not of *David*, but of his Seed after him, who should build the House : Therefore those Words of the *Psalmist, He shall cry unto me, Thou art my Father, and I will make him my First-born,* could not be a Paraphrase upon the Words in *Samuel, I will be his Father, and he shall be my Son,* because they were not spoken of the same Person.

No Third
Temple.

p. 260.

p. 264.

There is another thing in the Chapter 2 Sam. 7. which is a clear Argument that those Words Verse 14. *I will be his Father, and he shall be my Son,* do belong to *Solomon*. viz. they are spoken of that Person who was to *build an House or Temple to the Name of God*; and he was to be no other than *Solomon*. Now as to this Objection against the Application of this Prophecy to the *Messias* only, how strong soever it may appear to others, with Mr. *Whiston* it is no Objection at all; For sure, says he, no one that reads the Ancient Prophecies, especially the nine last Chapters of *Ezekiel*, can doubt that in the future Kingdom of the *Messias*, a most Glorious Temple is to be built under the Conduct of the *Messias* himself, and as the Place of his Habitation among his People *Israel* in those latter Ages of the World. And one Reason he gives why *David* was excused from building a Temple, was, because God's Heart was set on a much more Noble and Divine Temple

which

which should be built him there in future Ages, as the Seat of a more Glorious and lasting Kingdom than that which was so lately set up in Israel. A groundless and fantastical Conceit! For how should Mr. *Whiston* come to know the Mind of God in this Particular? Where hath God told us that when he ordered a Temple to be built by *Solomon*, his Heart at the same time was set upon another Temple, a vast way off from that First Temple, and which still remains to be built after the Second? I do not find any where that God Almighty's Heart is set upon another most Glorious Temple in the future Kingdom of the Messias, and at the Restoration of the Jews, and their Re-settlement in their own Land; but I find that Mr. *Whiston's* Head runs unaccountably upon such a Temple; and I am persuaded, if he had not gone to the reading of 2 Sam. 7. prepossess'd with a very strong Fancy that way, but brought his Opinion to the Original Standard, he could never have found his supposed Third Temple, in the 18th and 19th Verses of that Chapter; *Who am I, O Lord God, and what is my House, that thou hast brought me hitherto? And this was yet a small thing in thy sight, O Lord God; But thou hast spoken also of thy Servant's House for a great while to come.* Where he tells us, David distinguishes directly between the present less considerable Intimations belonging to himself,

P. 33.

P. 254.

p. 265,
266.

himself, and those noble Predictions which belonged to remote Ages. And again he says, That the Place contains a Promise of building a sure and never-failing House for David for a great while to come, when Israel should be ever fixed in the Land of Judea. But David means no such thing there ; nor did he so much as dream of so remote a Temple, when those Words fell from him ; he only distinguished between his own Palace and a Temple for God ; that is, between his present House that he dwelt in, and a future House that was promised him : He blessed and praised God who had made him so happy both in Fruition, and in Expectation also : *Who am I, O Lord God, and what is my House, that thou hast brought me hitherto ? And this was yet a small thing in thy sight, O Lord God ; but thou hast spoken also of thy servant's House for a great while to come !* That is, God had raised David to the Honour and Dignity of dwelling in an House of Cedar, v. 2. ; and as if that was but a small thing in God's sight, God moreover gave him a comfortable and delightful Prospect of an House for a great while to come : For God was pleased to let David know towards the beginning of his Reign, that the intended Temple, which he did not hide from him, should not be soon built : For that magnificent Structure was not to be raised by him, but by his Son Solomon after him.

him. Besides, even in *Solomon's* Time, the House of the Lord was not begun to be built till the Fourth Year of his Reign ; and so *David's* House for a great while to come was not an Imaginary Temple, yet to be built, no body knows when. The Expression signifies no more than the Distance of the self-same Temple that was promised to *David*, inasmuch as it was not to be built in his, but in his Son's Reign ; nor should the Building thereof immediately begin in his Son's Reign neither.

Nor doth the Promise of an House and Throne that should last for ever, and continue throughout all Ages, shew that such Promise was meant of the *Messias*, and belonged to him, and not to *Solomon*, as *Mr. Whiston* thinks. Says he, *The Kingdom and Happiness foretold, is often asserted to be for ever ; which Expression is repeated no less than seven times in this Prophecy before us ; as if the Spirit of God by the frequency of it had a mind to secure us from any possibility of expounding it otherwise ; that is, otherwise than as a Prediction of a thing absolutely to be fulfilled, and an unconditional and irrevocable Promise. But the Spirit of God hath expressly taught us to expound for ever in that Promise otherwise ; to wit, in that place 1 Chron. 28. 7. where God promises concerning Solomon, that he will establish his Kingdom for ever, conditionally, if he be*

1 Kings
6. 1. 37.
2 Chron.
3. 2.

The Promise of a Kingdom for ever, sometimes conditional.

p. 254.

con-

constant to do God's Commandments, and his Judgments : That is, so long as he and his Off-spring or Successors should continue obedient to God's Laws, the Succession on the Throne of *Israel*, as well as of *Judah* should continue in *David's Line* and Posterity.

The Everlasting Kingdom of the *Messias* is plainly enough foretold in several Places of the Old Testament, though we should not suppose it to be contained in the Promise of an Everlasting House and Kingdom, which is made in the Four Chapters forementioned. This is certain ; The Promise there can have no relation to the *Messias*, if it be but conditional ; and such a Promise it may appear to be from the Text now quoted : For that one Text, *1 Chron.* 28. 7. where there is a Promise of a *Kingdom for ever*, upon a Condition which is expressed, may seem an Explication of the same Promise of an Everlasting Kingdom in the other three Chapters, *2 Sam.* 7. *1 Chron.* 17, & 22. excepting only where the Promise is expressly absolute, as it is in *2 Sam.* 7. 15. 16. God promised concerning *Solomon*, that he would *establish his Kingdom for ever*, if he were constant to do his Commandments and his Judgments ; that is, he would then establish his Kingdom over all the Tribes, both over *Judah* and *Israel* ; and that Promise was purely conditional : But if *Solomon* was not constant to do all God's

- 1 Kings*
- 2. 4.
- 9. 5.
- 2 Chron.*
- 6. 16.
- 7. 18.

Com

Commandments and his Judgments, but committed Iniquity, still God promised that his Mercy should *not depart away from him as he took it from Saul*; that he would not take all the Tribes from *Solomon* as he took them from *Saul*; but one Tribe he would give nevertheless to *Solomon*, that is, to his Successors in the Royal Line, to establish *David's* Throne in them; and that Promise was absolute. And therefore for my part I do not see why the Promise of a Kingdom *for ever*, as it elsewhere occurs, and is repeated in those Chapters, may not be interpreted to be only conditional from *1 Chron. 28. 7.* with as much Reason as it may be thought to be absolute from *2 Sam. 7. 15, 16.*

Nor is there any Promise relating to the Messias and his suppos'd Future Kingdom, in those Words, *Moreover I will appoint a Place for my People Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a Place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the Children of Wickedness afflict them any more as before time, and as since the time that I commanded Judgments to be over my People Israel.* In that Promise Mr. Whiston says there are two Characters; one belonging to a time when the Children of Israel should never be removed any more out of their own Land; the other to a time when the Israelites were no more to be oppressed and afflicted by other Nations. Forasmuch as then as the Israelites have been Captives, and afflicted

No relation
to a Future
Kingdom
of the
MESSI-
AS in the
Promise,
*2 Sam. 7.
10, 11.
1 Chron.
17. 9, 10.*

P. 253.

afflicted since the Days of Solomon, he concludes therefore, that those Characters cannot belong to Solomon's Time: But here he errs again: These Words (*I will appoint a Place for my People Israel, and will plant them, that they may have a Place of their own, and move no more, neither shall the Children of Wickedness afflict them any more as before time, &c.*) were not intended for a Promise to the Israelites of perpetual Security against all manner of Removal and Oppression whatsoever, or that they should never be subject more to Captivity or Calamity from that time: No, the Meaning of the Promise is no more than this; In Solomon's Reign, when a Temple should be built amongst them, and fix'd to One certain Place, they should then never move more from Place to Place, as they moved for many Years with a moveable Tabernacle, in which God is said to have walked, as it was carried hither and thither by his own appointment, v. 6. Neither should the Children of Wickedness afflict them any more, as before time, or, as at the beginning, to wit, in Egypt. And as since the time that I commanded Judges to be over my People Israel; during whose Government, and I over them they were mostly fluctuating and in a more unsettled Condition; they were never to move more, as in the Wilderness; never to be afflicted more by the Children of Wickedness, as they were afflicted

and originally; when they were first a People, and some time afterwards, as in their State under the Judges: And so we see the Promise is restrain'd to a particular sort of Movement and Affliction which they had experienc'd in their less happy State before. The Promise therefore is this; Not that they should never be moved or afflicted more in any kind whatsoever, but never more in that particular kind and manner as before: They should never move more in the same kind at all, nor ever be afflicted more in the same kind, at least ever more so much as they had been; so that the Two Characters are by no means sufficient to prevent our dreaming of Solomon and his Days; p. 254: they properly belong to his Time.

But what puts it out of dispute with me, and must put it past dispute with every body else, I think, that this Prophecy, *I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son*, belongs to Solomon, and not solely to the Messias, is this; There are two Parallel Places (in two of the forementioned Chapters) in both which the Person of whom I speak these Words, *He shall be my Father, and I will be his Father*, is expressly nam'd to be Solomon; One is, 1 Chron. 22. 9, *Behold a Son shall be born to thee, who shall be a man of rest, and I will give him rest from all his Enemies round about; for his name shall be SOLOMON, and I will give*

SOLO-
MON
promised
by Name
in a PRO-
MISE of
the MES-
SIAS.

give Peace and Quietness unto Israel in his Days : He shall build an House for my Name, AND HE SHALL BE MY SON, AND I WILL BE HIS FATHER, and I will establish the Throne of his Kingdom over Israel for ever. The other Place is the same, 1 Chron. 28. 5, 6, 7. And of all my Sons (for the Lord hath given me many Sons) he hath chosen SOLOMON my Son to sit on the Throne of the Kingdom of the Lord over Israel : And he said unto me, SOLOMON thy Son, he shall build my House and my Courts ; FOR I HAVE CHOSEN HIM TO BE MY SON AND I WILL BE HIS FATHER, where the other Promise is also added and explained, Moreover I will establish his Kingdom for ever, if he be constant to do my Commandments and my Judgments : Which Promise therefore, as I have observed, cannot belong to the *Messias*, because it is conditional. Can any thing in the Earth be plainer ? Now Mr. *Whiston* ventur'd to quote two or three Texts from the beginning of those Two Chapters, but he did not care to quote on, so as to take any notice of the 9th and 10th Verses of the former Chapter ; or of the 5th, 6th and 7th of the latter ; for those Texts, though they belong to the Subject he was upon, were however not to be meddled with by him. It is true, there is a Heap of Texts in

p. 265.

Mar

Some Prophecies of the Messias.

39

Margin of his 260th Page, barely nam'd as to Chapter and Verse, into which he slyly thrusts the 6th and 7th Verses of 1 Chron. 28. pretending to refer us to those Texts, amongst the rest, only *for the sake of Brevity*. I would whisper in his Ear, that this seems not fair, nor does it look like Sincerity : For did he not know, and was he not well aware, that if he had honestly quoted in Words at length, the 9th and 10th Verses of 1 Chron. 22. or the 5th, 6th and 7th Verses of 1 Chron. 28. either of those two Places so cited by him, would have ruined his *Appendix*, and utterly overthrown his Unprofitable Reasoning there for so many Pages together, and must have made that Part of his Book Wast-Paper ?

Wherefore if this Promise, *I will be his Father, and he shall be my Son*, was meant of Solomon, as I have fully and clearly shewn was ; and if the Inspired Writer to the Hebrews applies it to Christ, as a Prophecy of him too, then it is a Double-Sensed Prophecy of the *Messias*. Q. E. D.

The other Scripture, where the *Messias* is Prophecy joined with Solomon, is the 72d Psalm, *Give the King thy Judgments, O God, and thy Righteousness unto the King's Son : He shall judge thy People with Righteousness, and the Poor with Judgment : The Mountains shall bring Peace to the People, and the little Hills, Righteousness, &c.* For in this Psalm

S O L O M O N
join'd with
the MESSIAS in
Psalm 72.

Solomon and the *Messias* are put together, and all the while only One Person seems to be spoken of; and there is nothing to give us to understand that the *Psalmist* speaks of Two Persons, but a lofty Strain here and there, and a Magnificent Character, which we are sure cannot belong to the Person plainly spoken of in some part of the *Psalms*. The *Psalms* begins with David's Praying, or directing his People to pray in this Manner and Form for himself and Solomon; Give the King thy Judgments, O God, and thy Righteousness unto the King's Son. For by the King's Son there Solomon is properly meant, because it must not be supposed that David prayed unto God to give Righteousness to the *Messias*; but yet the *Messias* was shadowed by Solomon and his Government, as we see clearly in the *Psalms*: For under the Person of the King's Son, Solomon, who (as we read in the First Verses of the *Psalms*) should judge God's People with Righteousness, and the Poor with Judgment, in whose Days the Mountains should bring forth Peace to the People, and the little Hills, should bring forth Righteousness; who should come down like Rain upon the mowed Grass, as Showers water the Earth: That is, Whose Excellency in Government, whose Glorious Reign should bring forth Peace and Justice, was a Type, Image or Shadow of the Kingdom of the *Messias*. I say, under Solomon's Person and Government

the *Messias* was describ'd, to wit, the vast Amplitude of his Dominion, v. 8. the Universal Subjection of all to him, *Verses* 9, 10. 11, 17. and the Eternal Duration of his Kingdom, *Verses* 5, 7, 17. Things that could not be true of *Solomon* at all, or at least were spoken very hyperbolically of him, if of him at all; but were truly and properly prophesy'd of *Christ*. So that here is a Double Character in the *Psalms*, and Two Persons meant, though all the while a Description only of One Person seems to be carried on. I do say therefore, that the *King's Son*, in the First Verse of the *Psalms*, was both *Solomon* and the *Messias*; He was *Solomon* properly, as the Prayer was made for him; Mystically he was the *Messias*, as appears evidently from a great part of the *Psalms*.

And now what doth *Mr. Whiston* say to this *Psalms*, the very Title whereof is, *A Psalm for Solomon*? How doth he make it out, that there is no *Solomon* here neither? Why, see the 37th and 38th Pages of his Book; we find that the way he takes to make the whole *Psalms* belong to the *Messias* only, exclusive of *Solomon*, is, by cutting from the *Psalms* its First Verse, as not belonging to it, and being only a Prefatory *Wish* annexed of late thereunto; and the Title, *A Psalm for Solomon*, he will allow to mean no more, than that the *Psalms* was

Mr. Whiston's Artifice for evading the Duplicity in Psalm 72d, and his imposing upon his Reader.

dedicated to Solomon; for he tells us, That David in the 72d Psalm being about to give a noble Account of the Messias and his Kingdom, to which the whole Psalm plainly belongs, begins it without a direct designation of the Person meant; **He shall judge thy People with Righteousness, and thy Poor with Judgment. — He shall judge the Poor of the People: He shall save the Children of the Needy, and shall break in pieces the Oppressor:** And so the Prophet goes on through the rest of that remarkable Psalm; I say, David begins the Psalm in this manner, though our present Copies have joined a Prefatory Good Wish or Prayer for the Prosperity of himself, and his Son Solomon, to whom this Psalm was dedicated; as if it were a part of it, to the no small disturbance and perplexity of the Reader; **Give the King thy Judgments, O God, and thy Righteousness unto the King's Son:** Which being taken as a Preface or Dedictory 'Εὐχὴ, all is easy, and the whole Psalm will most directly belong to the Messias. So that, Give the King thy Judgments, O God, and thy Righteousness unto the King's Son, is no more a part of the 72d Psalm, than a Preface to a Book is part of the Book; and he insinuates, that in the Primitive Copies of the Psalm, this was no part of it, and that the Psalm at first began without a direct designation of the Person meant,

meant
Right
sent C
or Pro
Son So
cated,
small
See
Prayer
Copies
it to b
But no
make
self wh
looked
themsel
Reading
course
of the
Scriptur
cannot
Solomon
only pre
ing true
Mizmor
Maschil
Lillomoh
Copies, a
though a
thinks he
Copies o
that is, v

meant, He shall judge thy People with Righteousness, &c. For he says, Our present Copies have joined a Prefatory Good Wish or Prayer for the Prosperity of David and his Son Solomon, to whom this Psalm was dedicated, as if it were a part of it, to the no small disturbance and perplexity of the Reader.

Seeing then the Psalm's beginning with a Prayer for Solomon, he makes a Fault in our Copies; this should imply that he knows it to be otherwise in the Ancient Copies: But not trusting to him, I was resolved to make all the Search I could, to satisfy myself whether it was so: Accordingly I have looked into the *Synopsis*, and the Criticks themselves; I have examined the several Readings in the *Polyglott*; I have had Recourse to the Copies nearest to the Times of the Primitive Inspiration, when the Scriptures were written; and after all, I cannot any where find that the Prayer for Solomon stands aloof off from the Psalm, as only prefatory to it. This is so far from being true, that even these Titles of *Psalms*, *Mizmor Ledavid* and *Mizmor Leasaph*, and *Maschil Leasaph*, and as in this Psalm, *Lillomoh*, are always written in the Old Copies, as if they were part of the *Psalms*, though all do agree that they are not. Men think he ought to have referr'd us to those Copies of Scripture where it is as he says; that is, where the First Verse is written as

if it were no part of the *Psalms* : But since we have neither any Marginal Reference of this sort, neither doth that appear to be true which he would have us believe, nor is there any thing like it, or the least Hint to that purpose to be found in the Ancient Copies, I must conclude, that his *Prefatory Wish*, or *Εὐφημία* is a mere Figment of his own Brain ; and he hath imposed upon his Reader after this fashion, that he might make a shift this way to evade the Double Sense of the *Psalms*, when in truth he had no other way to do it.

His ill Reflections on our present Copies of Scripture.

In the mean while therefore I cannot forbear observing, that as this Unhappy Writer hath reflected on the Expositors of the Scriptures with great Immodesty, disparaging and vilifying their Comments where they do not please him ; so he makes no less bold with the Scriptures themselves. It is enough to move one's Indignation against him, to see how he takes occasion to diminish, as far as in him lies, our Esteem and Reverence of those Divine Writings, and that by finding fault, as his way is, with the present Copies we have of them : For sometimes, that is, just when he pleases, Scriptural Passages are misplaced in our Copies : So *Deut.* 10. 8, and the Dates in *Exodus* are Dislocations. Elsewhere in Scripture the True Text is omitted, or excluded, and an Apocryphal one is thrust into its room.

root
7th
inst
Iniqu
men,
men ;
the C
Ancie
he pr
Iniqui
men,
Corre
Samuel

Thu
Copies
forfoot
says, h
corrupt
observe
of Scri
for a V
t seem
be no
Wish, a
belongin
well hav
Thus
ling thy
ness un
salm to
perfect
inally a
room

room. Thus in the 14th Verse of the 7th Chapter of the 2^d. Book of Samuel, instead of those Words there, *If he commit Iniquity, I will chastise him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the Children of men*; which yet he owns are obvious in all the Copies of the Hebrew Bible, and of the Ancient Versions of the 2^d. Book of Samuel, he presumes to read, *If his Children commit Iniquity, I will chastise them with the rod of men*, taking Psalm 89. 30, 31, 32, to be a Correction of the pretended Corruption in Samuel. p. 255.

Thus, as the great Master and Judge of Copies of Scripture, he takes upon him, forsooth, to mend Readings; and, as he says, he has *ventured* to correct our present corrupt Copy in Samuel. So likewise, as I observed but now, there is a certain Place of Scripture, which hath constantly pass'd for a Verse of the Psalm where it is; but it seems Mr. Whiston hath discovered it to be no more than a Complimental Good Wish, a Prefatory Flight or Flourish, not belonging to the Psalm, and it might as well have been spared. p. 259.

Thus the Prayer for Solomon, *Give the King thy Judgments, O God, and thy Righteousness unto the King's Son*, is no part of the Psalm to which it is affixed, but the Psalm is perfect enough without it, beginning originally at the 2^d. Verse, *He shall judge thy People*

People with Righteousness. Sometimes again, a Prophetick Scripture, which was originally in the Ancient Copies, is *wanting, or false Transcrib'd in our present Copies.* Thus the Prophecy cited by St. Matthew, *That Jesus should be called a Nazarene,* is *not found in the present Copies of the Old Prophets.*

p. 54.

And no Marvel that he takes the Liberty to deal thus with the Scriptures, discovering thereby his mean Opinion of our present Copies, since he guesses that some Eminent Predictions are repeated in several Places of Scripture, *for the prevention probably of the Mischief, which might otherwise arise from the Carelessness or Mistakes of Transcribers, and from the several Accidents which these most ancient Books were to run through in future Ages.* For thus he supposes, that *Mischief* might have arisen to the Scriptures, *from the Carelessness or Mistakes of Transcribers, and from the several Accidents, those ancient Books do run through in the Successions of Ages; even such a Mischief, as the loss of several Eminent Prophecies, had they been trusted to one single Place, or to one single Exactness of the Copy: Generally therefore, the eminent and ancientest Predictions of the Old Testament, are contained in several Places all to the very same purpose, for the prevention probably of that Mischief.*

p. 248,
249.

It seems then he makes little or no Account of a Watchful Providence, not much short of a *Miraculous Interposition*; which hath transmitted down the Copies of Scripture from Age to Age, genuine and uncorrupt, and preserved them from any *material* Mistakes in the Tradition and Conveyance. He hath no Notion at all of our having this Security, that they still retain their *Primitive Integrity*: He seems to imagine, that the All-wise God, after he had inspired his Messengers with the Knowledge of his Will, or otherwise revealed his Mind to them, and after he had mov'd them to commit their Revelations to Writing for perpetual Use in all Ages, e'en left the Transcribers of those Precious Originals, to Copy them without any strict Eye over them in their Work; and also left the Books themselves, when written, to take their Chance in the Ages they should pass through, without guarding them by a Special Providence, from Alteration and Corruption in those Ages. So that according to him, the Sacred Writings of Inspired Men of God, were Copied with no more Care and Exactness, than ordinarily other Writings are Transcribed, and the Holy Scriptures have been subject to Casualty and Accidents in the Ages of the World, as other Writings have been.

He

- He confesses, *That the Books which we call*
- P. 73. *Holy Scripture, were written with greater Sincerity, Honesty, Care, and Exactness, than any Human Writings whatsoever : But he nowhere says, That the Books of Holy Scripture have been preserved with a greater Care and Vigilance, and with a more constant Eye upon them, than any Human Writings whatsoever. He says indeed, I am confident, whoever duly considers the State of these Holy Books under the Judges, Manasseh,*
- P. 67, 68. *the Babylonish Captivity, and the Prophannation by Antiochus Epiphanes, will rather adore the good Providence of God, that they are in any degree come entire, and generally speaking, in good order to our hands, than be surprized at a few Defects or Disorders in some particular Places of our present Copies ; but*
- P. 69. *then he speaks of NO SMALL DISORDER in the particular Visions in Ezekiel, and so it seems there are a few Defects or Disorders, and those NO SMALL ONES from which the Good Providence of God hath not preserved our present Copies.*
- P. 72. *And are we to speak wickedly for God, and talk deceitfully for him? Are we to bear Christian People in hand, that the present Copies of the Books of Scripture are every where perfect, as uncorrupt, and as methodical as at first they came out of the Hands of the Original Pen-men themselves, when we cannot but know the contrary? And what do such*

scurvy

scurvy Passages as these in his Book tend to, but to bring Men to *Popery*, or *Deism*; that is, either to think the Bible but an imperfect, and a very uncertain Rule of Faith in Religion, or none at all? For we do believe, and cannot but believe, that such his repeated ill Reflections on our present Copies are of pernicious Consequence, to weaken the Authority of the Books themselves, and to render them of less Value and Esteem, and ill-disposed Persons will catch at what he says, to disparage these Sacred Records of Revealed Religion.

Now seeing he spares not the Sacred Copies, but is so forward to charge them with Imperfection and Mistake, one would think, that to justify his Complaints, he ought to have mentioned some particular Places therein, in which it is very plain, that there is the Redundancy, Defect, Mistake or Disorder, which he supposes; but he hath produced none. *Are we to speak wickedly for God, and talk deceitfully for him?* No, by no means: But then neither are we to talk causelessly and foolishly against God; We are not to slander his Holy Book, as defective and faulty, where it is not. *Are we to bear Christian People in hand, that the present Copies of the Books of Scripture are every where as perfect, as uncorrupt, and as methodical, as at first they came out of the Hands of the Original Pen-men themselves, when we*
cannot

cannot but know the contrary? No, by no Means. But the present Copies of the Books of Scripture may be every where as perfect, as uncorrupt, and as methodical as at first they came out of the Hands of the Original Pen-men themselves, for any thing he hath shewn to the contrary.

I do not insist upon so nice an Exactness in the Copies of Scripture, but that there may be here and there a very small Mistake in the Transcription, which is of no great Consequence, and which therefore may be very well consistent with the Integrity and Purity of the Scriptures, and with the Divine Care for their Preservation: And I observe, that he hath not instanced even in any one harmless Error of that kind; but the Reflections he makes on our present Copies are all utterly groundless, and in every Particular mentioned by him, he has the ill Luck to find Fault without Cause. It is not true, that the Prophecy of Jesus's being called a Nazarene, was *totidem verbis* in the Original Copies, but is *wanting or false Transcrib'd in our present Copies*. There is no Disorder in the Place he quotes out of *Deuteronomy*, nor are there any Dislocations in the Dates of the Visions in *Ezekiel*, and as to *2 Sam. 7. 14.* and *Psalms 72.* under Colour of Correcting the Copies and Readings there, which he wants Authority

to d
for t

T
the
shalan
tant

15,
give
serve,

Imma
that k
the go
refuse
that t
ber K

I sh
Words

Matter

" begi

" Juda

" the

" their

" of J

" vid

" ter

" Dest

" Upon

" meet

" to a

" if th

" upon

" were

to do, he would fain corrupt those Places for the Service of his Hypothesis.

The Third Single Person with whom the Messias is joined in Prophecy, is *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*; to wit, in that most important and remarkable Prediction, *Isaiah 7. 14, 15, 16.* Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a Sign; Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call his Name Immanuel: Butter and Honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and chuse the good: For before the Child shall know to refuse the evil, and chuse the good, the Land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her Kings.

The Prophecy Isai. 7. 14, 15, 16. explained.

I shall make use of part of Mr. Whiston's Words, in the Account he gives us of the Matter. The Case was this: 'About the beginning of the Reign of *Ahaz*, King of *Judah*, *Rezin* the King of *Syria*, and *Pekab* the Son of *Remaliah* King of *Israel*, united their Forces against *Ahaz*, and the Kingdom of *Judah*: Upon which the House of *David* were sore afraid, as dreading their utter Excision, together with the entire Destruction of the Kingdom of *Judah*. Upon this God orders *Isaiah* to go and meet the King of *Judah*, King *Ahaz*, and to assure the King and his People, that if they would depend on God, and rely upon his Providence, the *Israelites*, who were now Confederate with the *Syrians* against

p. 87.

“ against them, should be so far from be-
 “ ing able to Exterminate the House of
 “ *David*, and destroy the Kingdom of *Judah*,
 “ that both those Kingdoms should soon be
 “ destroyed themselves.” And because of
 the Consternation the House of *David* was
 under at that Juncture, to assure *Abaz* the
 more that he should be defended, and re-
 ceive no hurt from the two Kings in Con-
 federacy against him, God was pleased to
 offer him a Sign; leaving it to him to ask
 one in all the Machine of this Visible
 World, *either in the depth, or in the heights*
above, and it should be given him: But *A-*
haz was so impious and perverse, as to re-
 fuse to ask a Sign, pretending that he would
 not tempt the Lord; whereupon the Lord
 sent *Isaiah* to Expostulate with *Abaz* for not
 asking a Sign, and to give him one him-
 self. For the Prophet said to *Abaz*, or ra-
 ther to the Royal Family of *Judah*, *Hear ye*
now, O House of David, Is it a small thing
for you to weary Men, but will ye weary my
God also? Therefore the Lord himself shall
give you a Sign; Behold a Virgin shall con-
ceive, and bear a Son, and shall call his Name
Immanuel: Butter and Honey shall be eaten
that he may know to refuse the evil, and to
chuse the good; For before the Child shall
know to refuse the evil, and chuse the good
the Land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken
of both her Kings.

Here

Isaiah 7.
14. a Don-
ble-Sens'd
Prophecy.

Here the Sign of Deliverance given to *Abaz* without his asking it, yea, upon his refusal to ask any, is a Prophecy of the Holy Child, and of another Child; A Prophecy of a Child that should be Born in *Isaiah's* and *Abaz's* time, and of a Child that should not be Born till some Hundred Years after: A Prophecy, that within the time that a Virgin should marry, and conceive, and bring forth, and the Child should be grown to distinguish between Good and evil, *Abaz* should be delivered from the two Kings he dreaded. And a Prophecy, that a Virgin, whilst a Virgin, should conceive and bring forth a Son, for the Deliverance of Mankind. A Prophecy of the Birth of a Child to be called *Immanuel*, in Token of God's Presence with *Abaz*, and the House of *David*; and a Prophecy of a Wonderful Child, to be called *Immanuel*, who should be God Incarnate, and therefore *God with us*. A Prophecy of a Child, that might well be called *Immanuel* by Name, from the Providential Reason and Signification of his Birth, who yet should have another Name and Distinction given him, even *Maher-shal-hash-baz*, ch. 8. v. 3. And a Prophecy of a Child that should be *Immanuel* by Name, and therefore might well be so called from the proper Character of his Person; whose instituted, fixt Name nevertheless, to distinguish him from other Men, should

Here K be

be JESUS, *Matth. 1. 23, 25.* Surely, a Prophecy of this Nature carried a Double Sense with it: For, if *the Child* in the 15th and 16th Verses, be *the Son* foretold in the 14th; that is, if the Child that should eat Butter and Honey, that he might know to refuse the evil, and chuse the good, and before whose knowing to refuse the evil, and chuse the good, the Land *Ahaz* abhorred should be forsaken of both her Kings, be the Child *Immanuel*, as one would think he must be from the Natural Run of the Words; then it is past all Dispute, that the Sense is Double because the Prophecy of *Immanuel* is most certainly a Prophecy of the *Messias*.

This Mr. *Whiston* was well aware of therefore he will by no means allow of Coherence of the 14th Verse with the 15th and 16th. The 14th Verse is evidently one Prophecy with a Double Sense, or a Double Prophecy in the same Words. But he makes it a Single Prophecy, and the 15th and 16th Verses another Prophecy distinct from it, not at all connected therewith. For those Words, *Butter and Honey shall he eat, &c.* he calls *the other Prophecy*. This tells us, that after *Isaiah* had delivered the Prophecy of *Immanuel*, the Son of a Virgin, in the 14th Verse, he had done with him; and passes from *Immanuel*, to Prophecy of another Child in the next Verses, *Butter and Honey shall he eat, &c.* And who should

that be but the Prophet's Son *Shear-jashub*; that was present there before *Abaz*; God having ordered *Isaiab* to take his Son along with him, when he was sent forth to meet *Abaz*, v. 3. *Shear-jashub*, and not *Immanuel*, was the Child the Prophet spake of; perhaps pointing to, or laying his Hands upon him, when he said, *Butter and Honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and chuse the good; For before Hannah-* *mar, this Child here present, not this Son of whom he before spake, shall know to refuse the evil, and chuse the good, before He, who is already old enough to walk along with his Father* *either, shall come to Tears of Discretion, the Land by which thou art vexed, the Land of Israel, shall be forsaken of both her Kings, Pekah and Rezin, of whom thou art so much afraid. This I take to be the PLAIN MEANING of this Place; such a Meaning as CANNOT BE AVOIDED,* unless we suppose that *Shear-jashub* was by God himself particularly commanded to be taken along with him, for no manner of apparent Purpose at all.

This is his free Reasoning, which he is resolved to allow himself, and not to be bridged of by the Opinion of Double senses in Prophecy: For that Opinion, he says, has laid a Grand Obstacle and Stumbling-Block in the way of free Reasoning upon the Prophetick Writings; and he hates to be

p. 52, 22.

p. 13.

cramp'd that way : He insists upon the Privilege of Reasoning with Freedom ; and truly he has so Reason'd ; but I will say, more freely than judiciously.

SHEAR-
JASHUB
not the
Child
meant in
Isaiah 7.
15, 16.

For his Gloss upon the Prophecy, setting aside the apparent Force it puts upon the plain Words of the 15th and 16th Verses, appears to me upon other Accounts a groundless and ridiculous Fancy. The Sign given to *Abaz*, was a Child that was to be Born ; but lo ! Mr. *Whiston* produces for the Sign one that was then Born ; as if the Prophet had said to *Abaz*, A Child yet unborn, who is to be the Son of a Virgin, shall be unto thee a Sign, that thou shalt be delivered from thy Two Enemies : For I tell thee O King, before this Son of mine, whom thou seest with me, *shall know to refuse the evil, and chuse the good, the Land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her Kings*. Thus, rather than admit of a Double-Sense he would make the Prophecy Contradiction and Non-sense.

But to let that pass : His interpretation of those Words, *For before the Child shall know to refuse the evil, and to chuse the good*, &c. as meant of *Shear-jashub*, to whom his Father pointed, as he stood with him, grounded upon this Supposition, that *Shear-jashub* was a very young Child, that had not been long out of Arms, when he walked with his Father to meet *Abaz*. But that is manifestly

* Erat
aliquis E
Shear-jashu
pheta, cur
Philologici,
Classico ad E

than Mr. *Whiston* can tell : We have no Account of *Shear-jashub's* Age, when he went with his Father to *Abaz* ; and it is more probable a great deal, that he was then come to * Years of Discretion, than that he was not : And if he did already know to refuse the evil, and chuse the good, when his Father took him with him to King *Abaz* ; if he was a Youth, or a Man grown at that time, (and who knows but he was) then the Conceit is quite spoiled. Besides, it is not likely that *Shear-jashub* should be the Child meant for the Sign in the 16th Verse, since his Name had no Relation to the Defeat and Extirpation of the two Confederate Kings, that was so near, but it signified another Event, a great way off : For *Shear-jashub*, and *Maker-shalal-bash-baz*, *Isaiah's* two Sons, had not their Names given them by Chance, or on slight Occasions, but by the Special Divine Direction and Order. And there was a great Meaning in their being so called ; that is, there was Prophecy in their very Names : For they were given them for Signs of Things

* Erat jam ante editam hanc prophetiam *Esaie* filius aliquis ET QUIDEM ADULTUS, cui nomen *Shear-jashub*, quem à Deo jussus est comitem assumere Prophetam, cum *Achazo* iret in occursum. *Theauri Theologico-Philologici*, parte primâ *Christopherus Lockner*. Dissert. de loco Classico ad *Esaï*. 7, 14. p. 696.

to come in the Kingdom of *Judah*, as their Father said to them in the next Chapter, v. 18. *Behold, I and the Children, whom the Lord hath given me, are for Signs and for Wonders in Israel.*

So we read likewise, that the Prophet *Hosea* had two Sons, and a Daughter, upon whom Mystical and Prophetical Names were imposed, *Hosea* i. 4, 6, 9. Now *Shear-jashub* being interpreted, is, *The Remnant shall return*, as we find in the Margin of some of our *English* Bibles; and so his Name in its Signification looked a great deal farther than the nearer Event of *Rezin's* and *Pekah's* Destruction, even as far as the distant *Babylonian* Captivity: For it signified, that whereas *Ephraim*, or the Ten Tribes, after they were led into Captivity, should be dispersed in the World, without having any Promise made to them of a Time at which they were to return to their old Home; the Remainder of the House of *Israel*, *Judah* with *Benjamin* should return from *Babylon*, after they were carried thither, and be restored to their Ancient Seat at the end of Seventy Years.

And this in all Probability, was the Reason of God's ordering *Isaiah* to * take his

* Cum Regem accederet *Isaias* jussus erat secum ducere filium suum, cui *Shear-jashub*, boni ominis nomen, ad spem *Judeorum* excitandam, inditum fuerat. Grot. Annot. in *Matthæum*, cap. 1. p. 13,

Son with him, when he sent him to ease Abaz in his Distress : As if the Lord had said thus to the Prophet ; Go meet Abaz to comfort him, bidding him not to be afraid of his Two Enemies ; and take thy Son Shear-jashub with thee, whose very Name shews that the House of David can be in no Danger in Abaz's Time, thy Son being so named, to signify, that David's Family, and the Tribe of Judah should subsist, return, and flourish, even after a Seventy Years Captivity.

But Maher-shalal-hash-baz was the Child Immanuel, before whose knowing to refuse the Evil, and to chuse the Good, the Land that Abaz abhorred should be forsaken of both her Kings ; nay, before whose having knowledge to cry, my Father, and my Mother ! the riches of Damascus, and the spoil of Samaria, should be taken away before the King of Assyria. Ch. 8. v. 4. because his Name related to the approaching Overthrow and Ruin of those Two Kings ; particularly to their losing their riches and spoil some time before they lost their Lives, and were cut off from the Earth : I went to the Prophetess, says Isaiah, and she conceived, and bare a Son ; then said the Lord to me, call his Name Maher-shalal-hash-baz ; For before the Child shall have knowledge to cry, my Father, and my Mother ! the riches of Damascus, and the spoil of Samaria, shall be taken away before the

MAHER-SHA-LAL-HASH-BAZ
meant in
Isaiah 7.
15, 16.

King of Assyria; For the spoiler is at hand, or in making speed to the spoil, he hast'net to the Prey, or make speed to the spoil,* is the Signification of the Name, *Mahe-shalah-bash-baz*, as we have it explained in the Margin.

Some Learned Divines do conjecture that when *Rezin* and *Pekah* heard of *Tiglath-pilnezer's* intended Expedition against them to help *Abaz*, they delivered back to the Children of *Judah* the Captives and Spoils they had taken from them; For they did this * *before the King of Assyria*, or before his coming against them, as the Word may be understood. This is certain concerning *Pekah* and the Ten Tribes, that before the King of *Assyria* appeared, they restored to their Brethren of *Judah* what they had taken from them, as the Prophet *Ose* counsel'd them to do: Which Restitution of the Spoil before *Tiglath-pilnezer's* coming

2 Chron.

28. 9, 10,

11, 14, 15.

* Non dicitur spoliationem *Damasci* & *Samarie* per regem *Affur* factam esse, sed simpliciter narrat auferentem esse Robur *Damasci*, & Spolia *Samarie*, non à Rege *Affur* sed ante eum, antequam venerit *Affur*; Rex *Aram* adveniens Regis *Assyrie* subolens suis civibus non pepercit, sed contributionibus enervavit, ut suo exercitui Robur, *Assyrie* autem vacuas aedes velinquere posset.

Consideret Lector, annon is meritis velox spoliandus est, cujus absentis etiam gratia spolia restituitur, cives emunguntur, ut ipse adveniens parum proficiat homines inopes invenire possit. *Samuelius BOHL* Commentarius Biblio-Rabbinicus ad *Esaï*. 7. 12. p. 728.

ing, was, within a Year after the Birth of Maher-shalal-hash-baz, and so came to pass before the Child had Knowledge to cry, my Father, and my Mother! or to distinguish his Parents from others, as was prophesied. And when the King of Assyria, a Year or two after, had actually invested the Capital Cities of Rezin and Pekah; and upon his Successes against them, Pekah was slain by a Conspirator, and Rezin by the Conqueror; then was verifed also what was farther foretold, viz. that before the Child Maher-shalal-hash-baz should know to refuse the evil, and chuse the good, the Land which Abaz abhorred, should be forsaken of both her Kings.

2 Kings
15. 29, 30.
& 16. 9.

I observe all the while that Maher-shalal-hash-baz was Isaiah's Son by a Second Wife, whom he married very soon after the Prediction; Behold! a Virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call his Name Immanuel: Butter and Honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the Evil, and to chuse the Good: for the Young Woman, that was a Virgin when the Prediction was given forth, could not be the Mother of Shear-jashub, the Prophet's Elder Son: And this appears farther from the beginning of the 8th Chapter, where after God had ordered Isaiah to take him a great Roll, and write in it with a man's pen, concerning Maher-shalal-hash-baz; the prophet took unto him Faithful Witnesses

v. 1, & 2.

to

to record, viz. *Uriah the Priest, and Zechariah the Son of Jeherechiah*: That is, he took them unto him to be Faithful Witnesses both of his Second Marriage, and also of the Name God had given the Child, whom he should have by his new Wife. *And I went unto the Prophetess*, says he, *that is, his Bride, and she conceived and bare a Son*; which Words do imply his knowledge of her, after the Nuptials were celebrated.

It is very evident, that after this Prediction, *Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call his Name Immanuel. Butter and Honey shall he eat, &c.* a Male Child was to be born at that time of the World, who should be called *Immanuel*, for a Sign to *Abaz*, that he should soon get rid of his two Enemies; and it is as evident that such a Son, within less than a Year after, was born of a Woman who was a Virgin at the Time of the Prediction, viz. *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*; upon whose Birth into the Land of *Judah*, as signifying the Divine Presence, there to save *Abaz* and the House of *David*, that Land was called the Land of *Immanuel*. Chap. 8. v. 8.

If then this Prediction, *Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call his Name Immanuel*, be no more than a Single Prophecy, then it is no Prophecy

the Messias; because the Jews can prove (nay, the thing it self is manifest) that the Prophecy had a Completion in *Isaiah's* and *Ahaz's* Time; from whence it follows, that if no farther Completion of it was intended, the Messias could not be concerned in it. Wherefore Mr. *Whiston's* Doctrine, that there are no Prophecies with a Double Sense, doth hold up to the Jews that valuable Prediction (to use his own Words) concerning another Prophecy: For unless there be a Double Sense in it, which he will by no means allow, it cannot belong to the Messias at all, and St. *Matthew* misapplies it. And is not this Author an Admirable Champion for the Christian Cause? Neither can it justly be pretended, that this Prophecy is utterly lost to the Jews, and can be of no use to be alledged against them, in Proof that *Jesus* was to be Born of a Virgin; if it be granted, (as it needs must) that it hath been already in part fulfilled of old, even soon after the Prophecy was delivered, and so fulfilled in a Birth one Hundreds of Years before the Birth of *Jesus*: And I much marvel that Dr. *Alix* should say, *If I thought, as several Christian Divines do, that the Oracle of the Messias's Birth by a Virgin, may in a first Sense be understood of a Young Woman, viz. Isaiah's* wife, though it ought to be referred ultimately to the Birth of *Jesus Christ by the Holy Virgin*, I should

p. 12.

Preface to
the Arguments on
the Psalms,
p. 21.

I should look on St. Matthew's Citation of the Passage as Impertinent, and so the Jews think it.

For the Jews themselves acknowledge Double Senses, and Double Completions of some Prophetick Passages, to wit, Completions thereof, nearer and remoter, in the Type first, and then in the Anti-type; and they allow of Allegorical and Mystical Expositions of their Law, as I shall have occasion to observe By and bye: But upon this there is no need at all of my insisting here. For there is one thing, which, one would think, should be a plain Demonstration to the Jews, that another *Immanuel*, besides *Immanuel Maher-shalal-hash-baz*, must be meant in the Prophecy, and another sort of Birth foretold there, than only his being born to the married Prophetess; and an Argument it is, which the Jews have not answered, tho' they have * vainly attempted to do something to it, and it is this: To make *Al-*

Rabbi Isaac in his Book called *Chissuk Emuna*, or *Men Fidei*, could not but take notice of the terrible Argument, and tries to evade it; says he, *Should the Adversary object, What Miracle or Prodigy is it, that a married Woman should bring forth a Son? May not this be thought a Miracle or Prodigy? For Conception and Birth are not in the Power of Man and Wife; since many Women never conceive in all their Life: Many conceive indeed, but do not bring forth, but suffer an Abortion: That is to say, Every Birth is a Miracle, because some Women are barren, and conceive not, or their Issue prove Abortive, and never come to the full Birth.* And is not this a fine way of proving *Maher-shalal-*

firmly assured, that his Two Enemies whom he feared, should not prevail against him, and that God would be true and faithful to him. In that particular he was offered to ask a Sign of the Lord his God, to ask one either in the depth, or in the height above: God gave him his Choice or Option of a Miracle on the Earth, or of a Prodigy in the Heavens, and what he asked should be done: But foolish and wicked *Abaz* had more mind to great deal to ask help of the King of *Assyria*, and to depend upon him for Succour and Relief, than to be assured of God's Help by a Miracle, which he was so generously offered to ask, where, and in what kind he would. Yet nevertheless none would ask; as if, desiring of God to be secured of his Favour by such means, would have been a fault in him, even a tempting of God in that very Case: *I will not ask,* says he, *neither will I tempt the Lord.* And the Prophet said thereupon, *Hear ye now, O House of David, Is it a small thing for you weary men, but will ye weary my God also? Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign, Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call his name Immanuel.*

Now

the Birth to be a Miracle? But the Jew must be excused, though he ventured to be so ridiculous, because he could contrive no other way, to make that Birth look like a Miracle.

Now that a pure Virgin should conceive and bear a Son, was a Wonder indeed: Since the World began never was such a thing heard of, but in *Jesus* and *Mary*: We read of no thing like it in all Pagan, Jewish, or Christian History: The Lord created a new thing when he brought this to pass. It was a Sign given by Himself, and he gave it in a Solemn Manner; Not without a Behold! the usual Note of Wonder prefixed to it. *Behold! a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call his name Immanuel.* * And this was a mighty Wonder, of the same kind with the Sign either in the depth, or in the height above (which *Ahaz* might have asked

* *Abarbinel* the Jew would have us think, that possibly the Sign *Ahaz* was offered to ask, was not meant to be a Miracle at all; and for that purpose in his Comment on those Words, Let down thy Petition, or in asking life for thy self on high, *Ask a sign in the depth, or in the height above* he expounds them thus: Depress or elevate thy self when asking a Sign; that is, Ask it softly, and even in the deep of thine Heart, so as no body can hear thee; or ask it with a Voice and Face lifted up to Heaven, in the hearing of others: But this is a bold, and, I may say, impious and prophane Interpretation, because there can be nothing in such a Choice God should give *Ahaz*, Whether to ask the Sign whispering or aloud, with a low or high Voice; nor could such an insignificant and frivolous Option be worthy of God.

Ahaz's Answer to the Prophet, and his Reason for refusing to ask a Sign, supposes plainly, that *Ahaz* understood it was a Miracle, that was offered; *I will not tempt the Lord.* For indeed it is properly tempting God, to ask a Miracle of him by way of distrusting

he had pleased) and carried as great a Pro-
 portion of Wonder with it. But if no o-
 ther Completion of the Prophecy was
 meant or intended, than in *Maher-shalal-
 hash-baz*, and the Prophetess, then God
 gave *Abaz* and the House of *David* no Sign
 at all, in lieu of the Sign *Abaz* was offered
 to ask; that is, no Sign that was a Won-
 der; no Sign like some astonishing Miracle
 on the Earth beneath, or like some fright-
 ful Sight in the Heavens above. For what
 Wonder was it that a married Woman should
 conceive, and bring forth a Son? What
 Wonder, that the Child some while after
 his Birth, or after his having *Knowledge to
 say, my Father and my Mother!* should eat
 Butter and Honey for farther Nourishment
 and Strength, that at length he might be
 of Age to know Good and Evil, and grow
 to Years of Discretion? In this there was
 no Wonder at all: And, I say, this the *Jews*
 have never answered, nor can answer.

Nor

when we have no reason to expect one from him; But in-
 stead it had not been tempting of God, but Duty and
 Obedience, to have asked a Miracle; because it was the
 known and express Will of God, that a Miracle should be
 wrought by him; and yet, which is strange, he covered In-
 fidelity with a Pretence of Piety; and refused to ask a
 Sign the Lord offered him, under Colour of Unwilling-
 ness to tempt the Lord.

Nor is there any thing in the *Jewish* Objection, against the Second and main Completion of the Prophecy in the Birth of *Jesus*; that it was an Event a great deal too distant from *Abaz's* Days, to be meant a Sign for him to signify his certain Deliverance from the present Distress he was in. *R. Isaac* asks us, What Sign to *Abaz* could such a thing be, which should not fall out till more than 500 Years after him; and how could that confirm his Mind, which was not to come to pass in his Age? And the *Jew* is easily answer'd: The Prophecy of the Birth of *Jesus*, was a most proper and significant Sign to *Abaz*, for Comfort in his Case, tho' *Jesus* was not to be born till above Five hundred Years after the Reign of *Abaz*; because that Sign might assure him, that the House of *David* must certainly continue safe from Extinction for so long; that is, till the *Messias* was born out of the Family; and that therefore it could not possibly be exterminated in *Abaz's* Days, even tho' his Distress had been in appearance much greater than it was, and never so many Enemies united together against him.

Wherefore the latter of the Two Senses in this Prophecy, to wit, the Mystical Sense respecting the *Messias*, was vastly the more Important; and for that Reason the first Verse in the Prophecy quoted by St. *Matthew*

which, was designedly worded by the Spirit of Prophecy, to express that Sense chiefly; Behold! a Virgin shall conceive: Indeed, as I have said, here was a more Vulgar Sense also, whereby a Sign was given to *Abaz*, that within a little while he should see an End of his Two formidable Enemies; and the Words were intended thus to be understood likewise, as being fitted to be taken in that sense, viz. That *Abaz* should find Deliverance within the time that a young Woman should be married, and conceive, and bring forth a Son, and that the Child should be able to distinguish between Good and Evil: But the Expression in the beginning of the Prophecy, quoted by the Evangelist, suggests the other Sense more naturally, viz. That a young Woman, who was actually a Virgin, and even whilst she was so, should conceive, and bring forth a Son; and so the Mystical Sense is really more Literal than the other.

Accordingly we may observe, that after the Messias was come in the Flesh, St. Matthew in citing this Prophecy of *Isaiab*, took notice of the nearer fulfilling of it, in the Birth of *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*, which is the Accomplishment of the Prophecy in King *Abaz's* Days; but applies it purely and solely to the Conception and Nativity of our Blessed Saviour. Now all this is done, that it might be fulfilled, which was

L

spoken

Spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying Behold a Virgin shall be with Child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call his Name Immanuel; which being interpreted, is, God with us. The Evangelist stopp'd there, he quoted the Prophecy no farther: He did not go on with it, *Butter and Honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, &c.* because that part of the Prophecy related only to the Prior Completion of it in the Son of the Prophetess. But after Jesus had been Born into the World of a Pure Virgin, we find this Prophecy quoted in the beginning of the New Testament, no otherwise than as a Famous Prediction of His Wonderful Birth.

So then the Sum of the Prophecy, containing both Senses, is this. *Ahaz* was terribly afraid of *Rezin* and *Pekah*, who threatned the Subversion of his Kingdom and the Destruction of the House of *David*: For these two Kings had agreed and combined together, and fully resolved to Depose King *Ahaz*, and to put an end to *David's* Line, and to set up a New Royal Family in *Judah*, by making a Stranger a Foreigner, the Son of one *Tabeal*, King in the midst of it; And this Prophecy was to give *Ahaz* Ease in such his Perplexity. Now as here was a Double-Sense in the Prophecy, so the Prophecy was a Double Sign of *Ahaz's* Deliverance, and a Double

Isa. 7. 6.

See

Security against his utter Ruin by *Rezin* or *Pekah*, or any one else. The Promise of *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*, the Son of the Prophetess, chap. 8. was a Security to *Abaz*, that he should be rid of his two Oppressors within two or three Years : The Promise of the *Messias*, if *Abaz* understood the Prophecy in that Sense, must be a certain Sign to him, That the Tribe of *Judah*, and Family of *David*, must be preserved and stand, and could not utterly fail for several Centuries, because it could not be totally subverted and destroyed before the coming of the *Messias*, according to *Jacob's* Old Prophecy, That the Sceptre should not depart from *Judah*, nor a Law-giver from between his feet, till *Shiloh* come, or till *Immanuel* was born of a Virgin of *Judah* : For a Seventy years Captivity did not extinguish that Tribe and Family. When therefore *Abaz* thought of the Prophecy in the first Sense, he could no less than expect Deliverance from his two Enemies in a short time : If he thought of, and duly considered, the Prophecy in the Mystical Sense, he had reason to be comfortably assured, that nothing could extinguish the House of *David* before the coming of the *Messias*, and he might have defied all the Powers of the world.

Gen. 49.
10.

7 he MES-
SIAS fore-
told in the
Person of
ISAIAH.

The Fourth Person, who is with the Mes-
sias in the same Prophecy, is *Isaiah*; to
wit, in that Eminent Prophecy, *Isai. 61. 1,*
2. *The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, be-*
cause the Lord hath anointed me to preach good
Tydings unto the meek : He hath sent me to
bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty
to the Captives, and the opening of the Prison
to them that are bound; to proclaim the accep-
table Year of the Lord : For here *Isaiah* de-
clares, that he was Divinely Inspired, and
sent in an especial manner, to preach Com-
fort to his Captive Countrymen, and to
foretel their Joyful Return Home, and that
then their Country should recover its Anci-
ent Glory. So he Prophecies in the 4th
Verse, *And they shall build the old Wastes,*
they shall raise up the former Desolations, and
they shall repair the wast Cities, the Desola-
tions of many Generations : For that part of
the Prophecy can refer only to the time of
their Return from *Babylon*, when *Jerusalem*
and the Cities of *Judea* should be raised
out of that Desolate Condition, wherein
they had lain for 70 Years. But then, as
in this Prophecy he spake of himself, and in
his own Person, giving forth how particu-
larly he was moved by the Divine Spirit
upon him, to publish to the *Jewish Captives*
Deliverance and Restoration ; so in the be-
ginning of the Prophecy, he spake also of
the Person of the *Messias*, who was to have

a vast

a vastly greater Unction and Mission, and to publish the Good Tydings of the Gospel, and to proclaim Deliverance from a greater Captivity : For this same Prophecy our Lord applied to himself, as meant of him, and fulfilled in him. So we read *Luke 4. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21.* *And there was delivered unto him the Book of the Prophet Isaías ; and when he had opened the Book, he found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor ; He hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable Year of the Lord.* And he closed the Book, and he gave it again to the Minister, and sat down, and the eyes of all them that were in the Synagogue were fast'ned on him : And he began to say unto them, *This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears.*

Besides those Prophecies of the Messias, where the Four fore-mentioned single Persons are Subjects of the same Prophecies with him, There is one Prophecy of the Messias, where he is joined with a whole Nation or People ; to wit, *Hosea's* Prophecy of our Lord's being brought back from Egypt when he was a young Child, after he had been carried thither. *Chap. 11. v. 1.* *I called my Son out of Egypt :* Prophetical

*The MES-
SIAS
joined in
Prophecy
with a
whole Na-
tion.*

Words quoted by St. *Matthew*, and applied to our Saviour, *Matth. 2. 15.* The whole Verse, out of which the Prophecy is quoted, runs thus ; *When Israel was a Child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt :* For this Prophetical Passage of *Hosea* quoted by the Evangelist, *Out of Egypt have I called my Son*, looked both ways backward and forward ; it was both a Signification of something past, and a Pre-signification of something future ; both a Rehearsal of an Old Benefit, * and a Prediction and Promise of a greater to come. It had been true in God's delivering the *Israelites* out of *Egypt* in their Minority ; and it was to be true in God's recalling *Jesus* out of *Egypt* in his Infancy : And so here the Prophecy is single, but joined with another Sense ; that is, The very same Words are a Prophecy, and also a Declaration of a past Event, as one would think is very plain.

* Est hoc *Hosæ* Vaticinium ex eorum numero quæ Typica vel composita vocari possunt, quippe quæ genus complementum habent ; unum literale in Typo, hic in Populo *Israelitico*, alterum Mysticum in Antitypo, ut hic in Christo, utrumque quidem ex intentione Spiritus Sancti partim recensentis beneficium præteritum, partim promittentis futurum. *Synops. in Matth. 2. 15. p. 6. Spanhem. Dub. 64. p. 495.*

But Mr. *Whiston* disowns this Double-Sense in *Hosea's* Prophecy; for he will have the Passage a Prophecy not relating at all to the Deliverance of the People of *Israel* of old from *Egypt*, but only to our Saviour's returning out of *Egypt* at the Admonition of an Angel of God: And therefore, according to him, by *Israel*, *Hosea* 11. 1. must be meant the *Messias*; and to understand *Israel* in that place, for the Children of *Israel*, is a common Mistake proceeding from an Oversight in Expositors, who are so taken up with the ordinary Importance of *Israel* for the Children of *Israel*, that they can hardly think it worth their while to enquire, whether *Israel* hath no other meaning in the Prophetick Stile, and whether it be not sometimes directly the Name of the *Messias* himself. And yet, after his sending us to enquire, whether in the Prophetick Stile *Israel* be not sometimes directly the Name of the *Messias* himself, which he accounts is worth our while; two of his quoted Places, where he thinks the *Messias* is so called, viz. *Psalms* 24. 6. and *Isaiah* 44. 5. are nothing at all to the purpose. And as to *Isa.* 49. 3. *Thou art my Servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorify'd*; neither is it so certain that the *Messias* is named *Israel* in that Place; for some Interpreters do conceive, that *O Israel* there, ought rather to be rendred, *To Israel*. *Thou art my Servant to Israel*; that is, for the Good and Welfare of

The MES-
SIAS not
meant by
ISRAEL,
Hosea 11.
1.

P. 12.

Israel: For the *Messias* was the Servant of the Lord to bring *Jacob* again to him, or to raise up the Tribes of *Israel*; as we read in the 5th and 6th Verses of that Chapter. But what though *Israel* were sometimes directly the Name of the *Messias* himself, and it were never so plain that the *Messias* is called *Israel* here and there in Old-Testament Scripture, yet that by *Israel*, *Hosea* II. 1. is meant, not the *Messias*, but the People of *Israel*, is most evident from the Coherence of that Prophecy with the Chapter where it is, and with the foregoing Chapter. No, p. 52, 53. says Mr. Whiston, That Remarkable Prophecy is not only most exactly suitable in every Word and Expression to the *Messias* in particular, more properly than to the People of *Israel* in general, of old time; but it is also a Prediction by it self, having no visible Connection, or Coherence either with what went before, or what follows after in that Book; and so was, I believe, a distinct Prophecy concerning the *Messias* inserted into this Coherence of the Prophet, though it did not properly belong at all to it.

And here I must profess to stand amaz'd at our Author: There are indeed divers gross Errors in his Book, which do shew him to be a Loose and Injudicious Writer, but this Marvellous Assertion seems to be of a worse Nature still; surely he thinks that the bare Authority of so Great a Man as he

fancies

Some Prophecies of the Messias.

93

fancies himself, is enough to make the most manifest Falshoods appear to be Truths, and to go down for Truths with his Readers, without any the least Examination of what he says. To say, That the Prophecy, *Hos. 11, 1. Is a Prediction by it self, having no visible CONNECTION or COHERENCE either with what went before, or what follows after, in that Book, is a most strange Paradox, that can hardly pass for a bare Mistake, since there are the plainest Marks of a Coherence possible, ay, and several of them too.*

For (1.) *Israel* is the Prophet *Hosea's* **HOSEA** Subject in every Chapter of his Book ; and **11. 1. connected with the rest of the Prophecy.** that clearly shews a Connection of the 1st Verse of the 11th Chapter with what goes before, and follows after, in the rest of his Book, which is all one continued Discourse concerning *Israel*.

(2.) The Prophet elsewhere in his Book particularly mentions the Mercy of the Coming of the *Israelites* out of *Egypt*, Chap. 2. v. 15. and twice is God stil'd by him, the Lord God of *Israel, from the Land of Egypt*, Chap. 12. v. 9. and 13. v. 4. And who can think otherwise than that the same Deliverance is meant in the beginning of the 11th Chapter? *When Israel was a Child, I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt :* Especially since the Prophet in the beginning of that Chapter takes notice of the

IN-

Ingratitude of the *Israelites* to God for all his Mercies and Benefits towards them, of which the Deliverance out of *Egypt* is oftner, and more particularly recounted than any other ; *When Israel was a Child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt : I taught Ephraim ALSO to go, taking them by their Arms ; but they knew not that I healed them ; I drew them with the Cords of a man, with bands of love, and I was to them as they that take off the Yoke on their Jaws, and I laid meat unto them.* Is there not a visible Connection in these Verses ?

(3.) In the 5th Verse *Israel* is threatened that he should not return into the Land of *Egypt*, but the *Assyrian* should be his King, and doubtless he is the same *Israel*, of whom God said in the 1st Verse, *When Israel was a Child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt* : For the not returning into *Egypt*, in the 5th Verse, plainly refers to the being called out of *Egypt*, in the 1st Verse before ; they being both spoken of one and the same Unworthy and Proud king *Israel*, whose Punishment after his being called out of *Egypt*, should not be a returning to *Egyptian* Slavery again, but to serve the King of *Assyria*.

(4.) In the Second Verses of the 10th and 11th Chapters, after mention of *Israel* in the First Verses, the Prophet speaks of *Israel* in the Plural Number ; *Israel* is

emp

empty Vine, he bringeth forth fruit unto himself, &c. They have made goodly Images; their heart is divided; now shall they be found faulty, &c. When Israel was a Child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt; As they called THEM, so THEY went from them: And therefore the Demonstration is equal in both Places, that by Israel there the Prophet meant not a Person, but a People.

(5.) So closely connected are the 1st and 2d Verses of the 11th Chapter, that *Israel's* being said to have been called in the 2d Verse, is an Expression referring and alluding to that Call of *Israel*, which is mentioned immediately before in the 1st Verse; I CALLED my Son out of Egypt: As they (the Prophets) CALLED them, so they went from them: That is, *Israel* was called by God out of Egypt, by his Prophets from Idols; and very ingrateful to God they were, that they would not be called by them from their Idolatries, after they had been called by him from their Miseries: I called my Son out of Egypt; and yet notwithstanding as they called them, so they went from them; that is, when the Prophets were very zealous and importunate in admonishing the *Israelites* to turn to God, they all the while were obstinate in rejecting the Divine Message, and turned their Backs upon them that brought it; For nevertheless they sacrific'd to Baalim,

lim, and burnt Incense unto Graven Images.

But why should I multiply Proofs of a thing most manifest? The Coherence of *Hof. II. 1.* with the Prophet's Discourse, was so visible to *Julian*, and *Celsus*, and *Porphyry*, and to the *Jews* too, that upon the Evidence of the Connection of that Place with the Context and Scope of the Prophet, they doubted not to charge the Evangelist with perverting and depraving the Prophet, and wresting his Sense; inasmuch as he applies those Words of the Prophet to *Jesus*, which were spoken of the Children of *Israel*. And I am apt to think that *Mr. Whiston* is the first Man that ever offer'd to answer that Objection of the Adversaries of our Faith, by denying a Coherence, *visible* to every body but himself. I would only ask him one thing; Whether in case the latter part of the Verse, *I called my Son out of Egypt*, had not been cited by *St. Matthew*, or any other Evangelical Writer, for a Prophecy of the *Messias*, he had made the least doubt of a Connection of the whole Verse with what goes before, and follows after, in the Prophet? And I would willingly know of him, whether upon that Supposition it had not appeared to him as easy and natural a Coherence as any in all the Bible? If then in

Hosea II. 1. *Israel* signifies *Israel*, that is the Children of *Israel*, even the *First-Born*

Exod. 4.
22.

Jer. 31. 9. *Son* of God in the State of their Childhood

whilst

whilst a, yet they were but a Young People, as most certainly it does; and if withal, the Evangelist nevertheless rightly and truly quotes those Words of the Prophet, *Out of Egypt have I called my Son*, as applicable to our Saviour, and belonging to him: then in those Words of Prophecy there is a Sense distinct from, and besides the Prophecy of the *Messias*; Q. E. D.

Lastly, As I have shewn a Double-Sensed Prophecy of the *Messias*, in which a whole Nation, or Body of Men, are meant and spoken of besides him; so I shall now shew that there is another Prophecy, where he is joined with all Mankind; and that Prophecy we have in the 8th *Psal*m, and at the 6th Verse, *Thou hast put all things under his Feet*: For it is most evident that the *Psal*mist in these Words speaks of the Dignity of Human Nature: But the Inspired Apostle to the *Hebrews*, who must be allowed to be a good Expositor of the Inspired *Psal*mist, applies these Words of the *Psal*mist to *Christ*, as meant for a Prophecy of him too; *For unto Angels hath he not put in subjection the World to come, whereof we speak*; But one in a certain place testified, saying, 9. *What is man, that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the Angels; thou crownedst him with Glory and Honour, and didst set him over the Work of thy Hands; thou*

The MES-
SIAS join-
ed in Pro-
phesy with
all Man-
kind.

Hebr. 2.
5, 6, 7, 8,

thou hast put all things in subjection under his Feet : For in that he hath put all in subjection under him, he hath left nothing that is not put under him ; but now we see not yet all things put under him ; But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the Angels, for the suffering of Death, crowned with Glory and Honour. Where the Apostle's Argument by which he proves that those Words, Thou hast put all things under his Feet, are a Prophecy of Christ, is the subjection of all things to Man spoken of there, nothing being left that is not put under him. Thou hast put all things in subjection to Man ; that is, as the Apostle interprets the Psalmist, not only All Sheep and Oxen, yea and the Beasts of the Field, the Fowls of the Air, and the Fish of the Sea, and whatsoever passeth through the Paths of the Sea ; the Creatures particularly mention'd and expressed in the Psalm ; but all Created Beings whatsoever ; not only the Creatures of the Terrestrial, but of the Cœlestial World ; not only the Brute Animals, but the Angels too. But now we see not yet all things put under him, says the Apostle ; nor shall we ever see it, nor was it ever intended, that Men should be rais'd to that Dignity to be above the Angels themselves. But we see J E S U S, who was made a little lower than the Angels, crown'd with Glory and Honour : That is, with a Glory and Honour not common to Human Nature ;

Nature ; even with such a Glory and Honour, that HE it is, of whom this was prophes'y'd, that *all things* should be put under his Feet. The Man Christ Jesus, God-Man, is that Man only who should be Lord of the whole Creation: For he was the Sovereign over all Created Beings (none excepted) meant in that particular Clause of the Psalmist, *Thou hast put all things under his Feet* : Not only this World, but the World to come, are put in subjection to him; For all Power is given to him in Heaven, and on Earth: At the Name of JESUS every Knee must bow, of things in Heaven, and things on Earth, and things under the Earth: God hath set him at his own Right Hand, in the heavenly Places, far above all Principality, and Power, and Might, and Dominion, and every Name that is named, not only in this World, but also in that which is to come: And hath put all things under his Feet, and gave him to be the Head over all things to the Church ; Angels, Authorities and Powers are made subject to him. All Sheep and Oxen, the Beasts of the Field, &c. are more subject to Man, than the Inhabitants of the other World are to the Angels; but the very Angels themselves are subject to Christ. We see then the Apostle's Argument is plainly this ; Whereas the Psalmist said to God, *Thou hast put all things under Man's Feet* ; All things, without exception; and yet

Matt. 28.
18.
Phil. 2.
10.
Eph. 1.
20, 21, 22.

1 Pet. 3.
22.

yet hitherto we never saw any Universal Subjection of the Creatures to Man, nor shall we ever see any thing like it: Therefore in those Words of the *Psalmist* there must be a farther Sense than what was true of Man in the general: So that there are two plain Antitheses, and two distinct Oppositions in the Apostle's Discourse. In the former he passes from speaking of Angels to speak of Man; in the latter from Man to God-Man: *Unto Angels hath he not put in Subjection the World to come: But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is Man, that thou art mindful of him, or the Son of Man, that thou visitest him! Thou hast put all things under his Feet; none excepted: Well,* but as yet we see not this true of Man neither, nor will such a thing ever be: But we see JESUS, who was made a little lower than the Angels, crown'd with Glory and Honour: He is the *Θεοῦ Υἱὸς* of whom this was true, and in whom only the Words of the *Psalmist*, as Prophetical, were to be fulfilled.

If therefore we compare the *Psalmist* and the Apostle together, then in this Prophecy of the *Messias*, (*Thou hast put all things under his Feet,*) there is most evidently a Double Sense; to wit, the one belongs to Man in the general, the other to the *Messias* in particular: For as the *Psalmist* restrains the *All* things to the *All Sheep and Oxen*, and a

the other Animals of our Earthly World ;
and speaks of a Sovereignty only over
them, the Sense of the Words belongs to
Man in the general, and not to the *Messias* :
But as the Inspired Apostle takes the *All*
things in the utmost Latitude, for all Crea-
ted Beings, without any Exception what-
soever, even for all the Creatures both of
the Lower and Upper World; so speaking
of a Glorious Sovereignty over them all,
the Sense of the Words must belong to the
Messias, and not to Man in the general.

Q. E. D.

And this might have been very suffi-
cient to be spoken to the Prophecy, *Psalms* 8.

nor needed I to add any more upon it; on-

ly I thought good not to let Mr. *Whiston's*
Exposition of the 8th *Psalms* pass unrefuted :

For that there may be no appearance of a

Double Sense in any part of the *Psalms*, he

would bear us in hand that the *Messias* is

the Subject of the whole *Psalms*, and not

Man in the general at all ; which is mani-

festly false : He says, St. Paul argues that

the 8th *Psalms* is rather to be interpreted of

the *Messias*, the most remarkable Son of God,

than of Mankind in the general ; because the

Expression is more full and exact, if apply'd to

him, than if apply'd to the other; and that in

the strictest acceptation of the Words, they

would belong to no other but to him.

And be-
cause the Expressions of the Holy Pen-man were

M

not

The whole
8th Psalm
not a Pro-
phesy of
the MES-
SIAS.

p. 13.

p. 24.

p. 25.

p. 49, & 50.

not so strictly true in the one sense, as in the other ; St. Paul concludes that the Prophecy was only meant of JESUS CHRIST, to whom it could most exactly be apply'd, and not to Man in the general, to whom it could not be so ; and accordingly with a great deal of Truth and Justice confines its Original and Real Intention to Christ only. And his restraining the Psalm to the Messias, he counts is a Gloss thereupon so highly worth our observing, that we have it twice in his Book ; and he repeats it, that we might be sure to take due notice of it : For he tells us again, That the whole Psalm is not only exactly true, if apply'd singly to the Messias, but as we have already noted from St. Paul, is more strictly true of him, than of Man in the general. But alas ! St. Paul argues after quite another manner than this Man thinks, as hath appeared in part already, and I do aver, it is so far from being true, that the Messias runs through the whole Psalm, as the only Subject of it ; that from the Third Verse to the End, there is not the least tittle that directly belongs to the Messias, but only the Prophetical Clause I have been upon, *Thou hast put all things under his Feet* ; and this I can shew several ways. I shall begin with a Plain and Natural Paraphrase upon the Third and Fourth Verses of the Psalm, which alone is sufficient to recommend the Interpretation

pretation of Man in the general, as certainly the true one there; *When I consider thy Heavens, the Work of thy Fingers, the Moon and the Stars which thou hast ordained; what is man, that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man, that thou visitest him!*

“That is, When I look up in a Clear Night, and am intent upon the Philosophy of the Aspectable Heavens (for it was a Nocturnal Meditation of which the Holy Prophet here seems to speak, the Moon and the Stars only being mentioned, and not the Sun); when I view the vast Compass and Magnitude of the Firmament, and the sundry Glorious Lights that are there, and the Beautiful Order wherein those Cœlestial Bodies are disposed and plac’d; when from that Entertaining Sight I take Occasion to contemplate *the Glory of God*, which *the Heavens*, that Wonderful Structure, do *declare*; and consider well the most Excellent Greatness, and Infinite Power and Majesty of that Being, whose *Handy-work* they are; oft am I then struck with a Profound Admiration of the Infinite Condescension of God, who vouchsafes to take notice of such little Things as we are, that live and move upon this Spot of Earth, which to the Spacious Heavens above us is no more than a Point; and be-

ing thus affected, I cannot forbear say-
 ing within my self, *What is man, that thou*
art mindful of him, or the son of man,
that thou visitest him! Who then
 can imagine the *Messias* to be meant in
 this Place? Whenas it is plain, that the
Psalmist speaks here only of the Digni-
 ty of Man to which he is raised, through
 the Infinite Condescension of the Great and
 Glorious God that made the Heavens:
 But could these Words, *What is Man,*
that thou art mindful of him, &c. in the
 strictest Acceptation of them, belong to
 other but to the *Messias*? Or rather, could they
 possibly belong to him at all? For was it
 exactly and strictly true of the *Messias*, that
 it was an Infinite Condescension in God to
 have any regard to him, who yet was the
 Brightness of his Glory, and the Express
 Image of his Person? Did the Prophet in-
 tend to say unto God, *What is the Mes-*
as, God-man, that thou art mindful of him,
or thine Eternal Son, that thou visitest him?
 God forbid! Besides, if those Words of the
Psalmist, *What is man that thou art mind-*
ful of him, &c. ought to be apply'd to
Jesus, I would fain know why the same
 Words of the *Psalmist* elsewhere, may not
 be so apply'd, to wit, in the 144th *Psalm*
 and at the Third Verse; when not a Vision
 of the Magnificent Heavens, but Man's
 Frailty, and the Brevity of his Life, con-

ing to mind, was a cause of the Rapture!
Lord what is man, that thou takest knowledge Psalm 39.
of him? or the son of man, that thou makest 5.
account of him? Man is like to Vanity, &c.
 Was this spoken of the Messias? I say
 again, God forbid! Indeed, though the
 Messias was not meant in those Rapturous
 Words, *What is man, that thou art mind-*
ful of him! &c. yet I verily believe it
 was intended, that we should particularly
 think of the Messias with all Devotion and
 Thankfulness, whenever we read them:
 That is to say, the Words may well be ap-
 ply'd to the Messias by way of Inference,
 to illustrate the more Stupendious Divine
 Philanthropy in our Redemption by the
 Son of God. As thus, If the Psalmist in
 Contemplation of the more Common Fa-
 vours of Heaven to Men, and of the
 Constant Outward Blessings of Providence
 relating to this Life, could say, *What is*
man, that thou art mindful of him, or the son
of man, that thou visitest him? what rea-
 son is there for us to take up the same
 Words of Admiration, when we consider
 that Mighty Work of Providence, Christ's
 Coming in the Flesh, in the Fulness of
 Time, and to say, *What is Man, that thou*
art thus far mindful of him? What is the
 Reason of Man, that thou didst thus visit
 him? It was vast Humility and Conde-
 scension in the High and Glorious God,

who made the Heavens, that he visits us at all ; but that he should visit us too in *Great Humility*, that he should vouchsafe and be contented to take our Nature upon him, to be *made Flesh*, and *dwell amongst us*, as one of us *in the likeness of men*, and to lead a Life of Meanness, and Poverty, and Sorrow, and at last to die a Painful and Ignominious Death for our sakes ; this is a Degree of Condescension that surpasses all Wonder indeed ! So likewise from those Words of the *Psalmist*, meant of the Natural Dignity of Man, which the High God stoop'd so low as to confer upon him : *For thou hast made him a little lower than the Angels, and hast crowned him with Glory and Honour* ; we may justly take occasion to observe how much more wonderful was the Condescending Love of God to us in dignifying our Human Nature even above the Angelical Nature, in the Person of the Blessed *Jesus*, crowned with vastly higher Glory and Honour at his Exaltation into Heaven, after he had for a little space been *made lower than the Angels*, in his State of Humiliation, *that he might taste Death for every man*, as the Apostle accommodates those Expressions to *Christ Jesus*, *Heb.* 9. For though the *Psalmist's* Expression *Thou hast made him a little lower than the Angels, and hast crowned him with Glory and Honour*, are used by the Apostle with some

sort of Application to *Jesus*, yet it doth not follow therefore that they were meant in the *Psalms* for Prophetick Characters of *Jesus*: The Apostle doth not say, *We see JESUS, who was made a little lower than the Angels, crowned with Glory and Honour*; as one testify'd, or as it is written of him: Those Characters of Human Nature are used by the Apostle in speaking of *Jesus*, only as he was One of our Nature, and they are true of him very much otherwise than of our Common Nature.

As for Instance; This Character, *Thou hast made him a little lower than the Angels*, whether of Man, or *Christ*, the *Psalmist* plainly uses to signify the Dignity and Exaltation of him whom he speaks of; as is evident by the Context, *What is man, that thou art mindful of him! &c. For thou hast made him a little lower than the Angels, and hast crowned him with Glory and Honour: Thou madest him to have Dominion over the Works of thy Hands*. But on the contrary, the Words, *made a little lower than the Angels*, which are borrowed from the *Psalmist*, the Apostle uses to signify the Humiliation of *Christ* into a Condition of suffering Death for Man: Therefore the Character, *Thou hast made him a little lower than the Angels*, would not be a Prophecy of *Christ*, because though the Words be supposed to be the same in the *Psalms*, and in the Epistle, yet

they do not signify alike in both, but two distinct and opposite things; to wit, in the one, the Exaltation of Man, in the other, the Humiliation of *Christ*; but neither is the Character and Expression altogether the same in both places: For the *Hebrew* Word *Megnat*, and *Beaxi n* in the *Septuagint*, *Psalms* 8. 5. signify a little lower, in respect of *Dignity*; but *Heb.* 2. 9. *Beaxi n* signifies a little lower in respect of * *Time*; That is, Man was made in *Dignity* a little lower than the *Angels*; *Jesus* was made lower than the *Angels* for a little *Time*, that he might taste *Death* for every man, And indeed it would be very absurd to suppose that *Beaxi n*, *Heb.* 2. 9. signifies a little lower in respect of *Dignity*, as it doth *Psalms* 8. 5. because such an Interpretation makes the *Apostle* repugnant to himself; For the *Apostle* had been asserting and proving the High *Dignity* of the Lord *Jesus* above the *Angels*; therefore certainly he did not intend to say withal, that *Jesus* was in *Dignity* a little lower than the *Angels*; that were a flat *Contradiction*. The *Apostle's* Meaning therefore is, That *Jesus*, who was a great deal higher than the *Angels*, and had vastly the *Precedence* in the *Heavenly Court*, was

* So the Word signifies likewise, *Psalms* 37. 10. *Isa.* 10. 25. & 26. 20. & 29. 17. *Hagg.* 2. 6. *Acts* 5. 34.

made however lower than they for a little space of time, and to suffer Death for Man. And this is the Great Evangelical Truth. Besides, if Jesus was a little lower than the Angels in point of Dignity, then there could not be that difference between the Angels and Jesus, on the Account of Sovereignty over the Creatures of the Next World, which the Apostle observes Angels have nothing of. *Unto Angels God hath not put in Subjection * the World to come*, says the Apostle, meaning, that the Subjection of that World was peculiar to Jesus, and that it

* Some do think that by *the World to come* here is meant the Christian Church, or the State of Mankind under the Gospel; because the Age of the Messias, and the Evangelical State, hath sometimes been called *Μέλλον Ἄσιν*, The Age to come. But what Sense could there be in this manner of Expression, or what could the Apostle mean in saying, That God hath not put in Subjection to the Angels the State of Christianity? Indeed the Law was delivered by the Ministry of Angels, v. 2. and the Gospel not by them, but immediately by our Lord himself, v. 3. Was therefore the Gospel, which was not committed to the Ministry of Angels, meant by *the World to come*, which God had not put into Subjection to Angels? No, by no means. By *τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν*, we are not to understand an Age or State of Things to come, as *Μέλλον Ἄσιν* signifies, but the Invisible World, where Angels and separate Spirits are, which is indeed a World now actually Existing; but with respect to us is *the World to come*, because at present we know but little of it, and as yet we know not what we shall be there, but shall attain to a full knowledge of it hereafter. *Ἄσιν* and *οἰκουμένην*, both which Words we render *World* in our English, are yet Words of a different Import and Signification in themselves: For *Ἄσιν* signifies an Age, but *οἰκουμένην*, which is

it was his High and Singular Prerogative to be Sovereign there : But if *Jesus* was in respect of Dignity made any thing *lower than the Angels*, who are not Princes of the World to come ; then to be sure the future World is no more subject to him, than to them. Wherefore the Apostle's Sense is plainly this ; The World to come, which is not made subject to Angels, is subject to *Jesus* : He is the Lord of that Other World which is not put in Subjection to Angels, who yet was for a little while *made lower than the Angels*.

is derived from *Οἶκος* or *Οικία*, an House, or *Οικίαν*, to dwell, never signifies an Age or State of Things, but properly a Place or Dwelling ; and wherever in all the New Testament the Word *Οικουμένην*, is by it self, it signifies the present World we live in, or a chief part of it, or the Dwellers in it, or the most considerable part of them ; and *Μέλλον* here being put to it, it signifies the Next World with the Inhabitants of that Place ; *Περί ἧς λαλῶμεν* : The Apostle doth not say, *Περί ἧς λαλῶ*, of which I speak, but we speak ; that is, We who are Apostolical Preachers of the Gospel of Christ, who *hath abolished Death, and brought Life and Immortality to Light through the Gospel* ; For another World, or the World to come, is our great Theme. So then it is plain, that the 5th Verse of the 2d. Chapter to the *Hebrews*, is but a Continuation of the Apostle's Discourse at the end of the first Chapter, concerning the surpassing Dignity of the Lord *Jesus* above the Angels ; only the Apostle thought fit to begin the 2d. Chapter with interposing a serious Exhortation, that we would *give the more earnest heed to the Doctrine of Christ*, which we have heard, forasmuch as his Ministry is far more Excellent, than the Ministry of Angels.

Some Prophecies of the Messias.

III

To go on with my Proof, that no part of the *Psalms*, from the 3^d. Verse, relates to the *Messias*, but the Passage in the 6th Verse; *David* proceeds, *Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet; All Sheep and Oxen, yea, and the Beasts of the Field, the Fowl of the Air, and the Fish of the Sea, and whatsoever passeth through the Paths of the Seas.* Now is this Character more strictly true of the *Messias*, that he is Lord of the Brutal Part of the Creation? Is not this true of Man in the general, That all *Sheep and Oxen, the Beasts of the Field, &c.* are put under his Feet? And how can that be a distinguishing Character of the *Messias*, which is common to Human Nature? Besides, if the *Psalmist's* asserting the Sovereignty of Man over all the Earthly Creatures had any thing of the *Messias* in it, it might as well be pretended, that *Gen. i. 28. and 9. 2.* were meant of the *Messias*, since the *Psalmist* took the latter part of his *Psalms* from those Texts: And were those two Places in *Genesis*, Predictions of the *Messias*?

In the last Place, as I have said, the Apostle himself, an Inspired Expositor of the 8th *Psalms*, witnesseth, That the Subject of it from the 3^d. Verse, is Man in the general, and Man only, excepting the Prophecy in the 6th Verse. Mr. *Whiston* says, St. Paul

The 6th Verse of the 8th Psalm, the Prophetic part of the Character there.

argues;

argues, that the 8th Psalm is rather to be interpreted of the Messiah, the most remarkable Son of God, than of Mankind in the general. That is very strange, since St. Paul's Discourse clearly argues the contrary: For the Argument the Apostle is upon, supposes, that the Psalmist speaks of Man in the general, in the Verses of it quoted from him. It is the very Point the Apostle argues from: *Unto Angels hath he not put in subjection the World to come: But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man, that thou visitest him! Thou madest him a little lower than the Angels; Thou crownedst him with Glory and Honour; Thou didst set him over the works of thy hands; THOU HAST PUT ALL THINGS IN SUBJECTION UNDER HIS FEET; For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him: That is, however this was never yet verified in Man, nor shall it ever be true of Man; But this we see is fulfilled in Christ Jesus, who is crowned with that Glory and Honour to be over the Creatures of the Whole Universe: So that the Reasoning of the Apostle, Heb. 2. from Psalm 8. is founded upon the Supposition, that Man in the general is the Subject of the quoted part of the Psalm. Mr. Whiston imagines, that because the Apostle quotes*

quod
art
fion
ther
muc
thof
mim
Prop
the
to w
feet:
cing
that
is m
fon of
him a
cordi
ting
der h
and f
Quot
doth
All th
restra
Sheep
Field,
imper
shall
herea
WH
is mor
of the

Some Prophecies of the Messias.

113

quotes these Words, *What is man that thou art mindful of him, &c.* when he has occasion to speak of Jesus, he therefore quotes them as a Prophecy of Jesus: But he is much mistaken. For the Apostle quotes those Words, *What is man, that thou art mindful of him, &c.* not as if they were the Prophecy of Jesus, but only to bring in the Clause where indeed the Prophecy lay, to wit, *Thou hast put all things under his feet*: And it was for the sake of introducing this Passage, and for no other Reason, that he quotes the Passages before it, *What is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man, that thou visitest him! Thou madest him a little lower than the Angels, &c.* Accordingly we may observe, That after quoting these Words, *Thou hast put all things under his feet*, he had done with the Psalmist, and falls to explaining this last part of his Quotation, and applying it to Jesus. He doth not go on quoting from the Psalm the *All things* particularly express'd there, and restrained to the Sublunary Creatures, *All Sheep and Oxen, yea, and the Beasts of the Field, &c.* because that had been altogether impertinent to his purpose; of which I shall have a fair Occasion to speak more hereafter.

Wherefore from what hath been said, it is most plain, That these very same Words of the Psalmist, *Thou hast put all things under*

der his feet, are both a Character of Man, and also a Prophecy of *Christ*. Man is Lord of the Animals of this Visible, Inferior World; God-Man is Lord not only of the Brutes, but of Angels, and Devils too. The *Psalmist* in restraining the *All things* subjected to Man, to *All Sheep and Oxen, yea, the Beasts of the Field, &c.* limits the Character in those Verses of the *Psalm* to Man in the general. As to the farther meaning of the Inspired *Psalmist's* Words, in extending the *All things* under Man's Feet, even to all Creatures whatsoever, without Exception, it pleased the Holy Ghost that this Explication of his Words, as a Prophecy of the *Messias*, should not be made by the *Psalmist* himself, but reserved for another Inspired Writer after him, even after the *Messias* should be come into the World.

Mr. WHISTON'S
Explications of some
Prophecies of the Mes-
sias, not to
be commen-
ded.

* Works
of the
Learned
for Decem-
ber, 1707.
p. 751.

And now let all Men judge whether the Abstracters of Mr. Whiston's *Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies*, have made a true and just Report to the World concerning his Book, in having given out, that the *Prophecies* * relating to the *Messias*, which he hath handled therein, are explained with GREAT JUDGMENT by him; and whether in ascribing so much Judgment to him in those Discourses, they have shewn that they are Judicious themselves. And since, as it seems, it was not enough for them barely to Abridge the Book of their

Learned

Lear
Error
indig
to vi
can;
Body
a wh
In lik
the C
gainst
large
bulus
his tel
his A
quitted
JUDG
SPIC
Th
lating
with t
for In
78. 2.
mouth
of old
or a l
the Gr
himself
Matth
ESU
withou
t mig
Prophe

Learned Author, without giving their own Erroneous Sense of it too, and extolling so indigested a Piece, I think they are obliged to vindicate themselves and him, if they can; otherwise, perhaps, henceforward no Body will value a Book, or care to buy it a whit the more for their commending it. In like manner the World will expect from the *Censura*, a Defence of Mr. *Whiston* against my Book; and here's Work for a large Dialogue: For I do not see how *Eubulus* can come fairly off, unless he justifies his telling the World, That Mr. *Whiston*, in his *Accomplishment of the Prophecies*, has acquitted himself WITH GREAT CARE AND JUDGMENT, AND WITH EQUAL PERSPICUITY AND EVIDENCE.

There are other Places of Scripture relating to the *Messias*, of the same Nature with those I have already explained. As for Instance: That Passage of *Asaph*, *Psal.* 78. 2. is of the like sort; *I will open my mouth in a parable, I will utter dark sayings of old*: For this place St. *Matthew* quotes for a Prediction in what manner the *Messias*, the Great Divine Teacher, should deliver himself, when he came into the World, *Matth.* 13. 34, 35. *All these things spake JESUS to the multitude in parables, and without a parable spake he not to them; That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables,*

The 78th Psalm expounded.

ables, *I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world.* Therefore these Words, *I will open my mouth in parables, I will utter dark sayings of old,* have two distinct Senses; the Matter of the Parables being two very different things, viz. History and Doctrine, both which were given forth Parabolically, the former by the Psalmist, the latter by Christ.

Mr. Whiston thinks otherwise, and says, That the words do most strictly agree to our Saviour, and are no part of the Series of the Psalmist; and this he takes to be one of the places, where, as he tells us, Prophecies are quoted by the Evangelists out of the Old Testament, contrary to the Series and Coherence of those Places wherein they at present appear. Now I must confess, that it is much easier to account for those Prophetick Words, *I will open my mouth in parables, I will utter dark sayings of old,* as they are Prophetick and belong to Christ, than to make out their Coherence with the rest of the Psalm; because at first sight there seems to be nothing of Parable in all the Psalm; and it may be thought pretty hard to reconcile the promise of a Parable with giving an History: For is there Mystery in History? Are Narratives of Fact Dark Sayings? And then there is another Difficulty besides: How should a Collection of the old and well-known Histories of the Jewish Nation

tion, quite down from their Egyptian Bondage, till the Days of David, be a Collection of Dark or Mysterious Things, long hidden from Mankind? And indeed the 2d. and 3d. Verses of the Psalm, seem to be something repugnant; *I will open my mouth in a parable; I will utter dark sayings of old, which we have heard and known, and our Fathers have told us*: For how can that be a Secret, which is heard and known? Or how could those Sayings of the Psalmist to the Israelites, be a Dark Discourse to them, that were Sayings of Things which they were well acquainted with, even an History of Facts of which their Fathers had been Eye-witnesses, and which were carefully recorded, and transmitted down to them in their Books?

But to all this I Answer; That the Psalm, though an History, hath the Nature of a Parable; because it is an History of Figures of Future Things, being an History of the People of the Messias, from whom he should come, and a Series of certain Events that relate to his appearing. Which History therefore, so far as it points to him, may be said to contain even those very Mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, that were to be made known by him; *I will open my mouth in a parable; I will utter dark sayings of old, or I will utter things that have been kept secret from the Foundation of*

the World; that is, I will utter Remarkable Facts of Providence, which do prefigure a Revelation of Mysteries, that were never revealed before.

I observe that another of the *Psalmists* hath his Parable likewise, which he invites not the *Israelites* only, but all Mankind to attend to, *Psalm 49*. And he begins his *Psalm* thus: *Hear this, all ye people, give ear all ye inhabitants of the world, both low and high, rich and poor together; My mouth shall speak of wisdom, and the meditation of my heart shall be of understanding: I will incline mine ear to a parable; I will open my dark saying upon the harp.* And the Parable he takes up is Matter of Doctrine, not of History: For it is a Persuasive to Contempt of Riches, from the Consideration of Death, and an Instruction against Pride in Wealth, or envying others for it; forasmuch as Death cuts off the Great Men of this World from all their Earthly Pomp and Glory; and no Man, let him be ever so wealthy, can by his Abundance deliver himself from Death, or Ransom another from it that is seized with a Mortal Disease; or redeem a Soul from the Miseries of the next World. And this plain Moral Lesson the *Psalmist* calls a Parable; because though it be so known a thing, and so very obvious to common Observation, that Rich Men die as well as others; yet,

the generality of Covetous Worldlings, it is as a Parable when they are told of it : For they mind it not, nor will they learn Wisdom from the Admonition, as if they understood it no better than a Riddle ; and to be sure all notices of a State after Death, and of Punishment in another Life, are as *Dark Sayings* to them.

And now we are to note, That whereas there are two Parabolical *Psalms*, viz. the 49th and 78th, in one of which a Moral Instruction, in the other an History of Things, are the Subject, and both begun by the inspired Composers much alike ; *I will incline mine ear to a parable, I will open my mouth in a parable* ; the Prophecy of our Saviour's teaching in Parables is cited by St. Matthew, not from the Doctrinal, but from the Historical *Psalms*. And truly considering the wide difference between a Parable and an History, the prefacing of an History in this manner is enough to make both Jew and Christian to conclude, that there must be something more than ordinary in it. We Christians may clearly see the reference of the *Psalms* to the Messias, and the Gospel-State : For the Substance of the History we have in the *Psalms* is this, That God chose the Israelites above all the Nations of the World, to be his Peculiar People ; That he did great and marvellous things for them from time to time, who

nevertheless grievously rebelled and sinned against him, and often provoked him to Anger ; and yet notwithstanding he destroyed them not, but spared them ; and when he punished them, he did it less than they deserved : That the Tribe of *Judah* was more particularly favoured by him, v. 68. and *David's* Family in that Tribe most of all, v. 70. Which things are a Parable : For those three Elections recorded in the *Psalms*, were all purely on the account of the *Messias* ; That is to say, God chose the Children of *Israel* out of the rest of the World, and *Judah* out of the other Tribes, and *David's* House from amongst all the Families of *Judah* ; because our Lord, *as concerning the Flesh*, was to come of that People, and that Tribe, and that Family. So that *Christ's* Coming is the Subject of the whole *Psalms* in the Mystery ; and consequently the same Matters of Fact, which were commonly known, as they were faithfully Registered for Posterity, might well be called Parabolical Passages too, in respect of the darker Signification, as *Christ* was obscurely meant in them. Wherefore in *Asaph's* Prophecy there is evidently a Two-fold Sense. The Historical, but Mystical *Psalms*, was a Parable that *Asaph* declared he would utter when he said, *I will open my mouth in a Parable* ; that was one meaning of the place. But then it was farther intended by the H

ly Ghost, that in this very Promise and Engagement, *I will open my mouth in a parable, I will utter hard sayings of old*, the Psalmist should represent the Person of the Messias our Saviour, and so prophesy of his frequent use of Parables in teaching the Doctrine of Salvation, when he should utter things that have been kept secret from the Foundation of the World.

Of the like kind is Jeremiah's Prophecy, **JEREMIAH** relating to the Miseries of the Babylonish Captivity: *Thus saith the Lord, A Voice was heard in Ramah, Lamentation, and bitter Weeping; Rachel weeping for her Children, refused to be comforted for her Children, because they were not*, Jerem. 31. 15. For those Words of Prophecy had respect to another dismal Passage, a little after the Birth of the Messias, and therein the Prophetic Spirit looked so far: St. Matthew applying the Prophecy to the Slaughter of the Infants at Bethlehem, Matth. 2. 17. *Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the Prophet, saying, In Ramah was there a Voice heard, Lamentation and Weeping, and great Mourning; Rachel weeping for her Children, and would not be comforted, because they are not.*

31. 15. a
Prophecy of
two distinct
Events.

So that this is most clearly a Double Prophecy; It belongs to the Captivity of the Jewish People, as is evident from the two Verses following in the Prophet, where
N 3. their

their Return is promised ; and it belongs also to the Slaying of the Children in *Bethlehem* ; For that is evident from *St. Matthew's* quoting the Prophecy, as fulfilled in *Herod's Cruelty*.

But *Mr. Whiston* finds something to say, to evade the Duplicity of this Prophecy : He distinguishes between a Prophecy, and a *Poetical Description* ; *Jeremiah's* quoted Words are properly a Prophecy of the *Babylonish Captivity* ; but so far as they related to the Murther of the Infants, they were *no Prophecy at all, but a Noble Poetick Representation of the Miseries of Persons near the Place where Rachel was Buried* : For this Representation might be as well introduced upon this sad Occasion of the Slaughter of the Infants in *Bethlehem*, as on the like Occasion of the Captive Jews. And he shews the difference between the fulfilling or verifying a Prophecy, and the fulfilling or verifying a Poetical Description. A Prophecy is then fulfilled or verified, says he, when that Event comes to pass, which is therein foretold, and no otherwise ; but a Poetical Description is then fulfilled or verified, when such an Event happens, to which it may as properly and truly be applyed, as it was to that for which it was originally intended : So that tho' the Prophecies of the Old Testament have but * one proper and real Completion, yet such Poetick Descriptions or Lamentations may be frequently

*He owns a double, yea, a treble Completion of one sort of Prophecy, p. 211, 212, 213.

ful-
Imp-
the
the
St.
phe
of t
but
fulf-
Prop
Mr.
that
ken
or i
was
tick
Cru
the
the
Tore
whic
one
fulfi
yet
Jere
is th
vent
truly
it wa
ston's
an E

fulfilled or verified, without any manner of Impeachment of the Person who introduces them upon the like Occasions afterwards.

Now it should seem something odd, that the Slaughter in *Bethlehem* should be said by *St. Matthew* to be a Completion of a Prophet's Words, and yet that those very Words of the Prophet should be *no Prophecy at all, but a Noble Poetick Representation*. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by *Jeremy the Prophet*; so says the Evangelist. Ay, but *Mr. Whiston* says otherwise: Then, or in that Event, was fulfilled that which was spoken by *Jeremy the Prophet*, not as a Prophet, or in the way of Prophecy, but that which was spoken by him only in the way of *Poetick Representation*: And whereas *Herod's Cruelty* was the main Accomplishment of the quoted Prophecy, as may appear from the Evangelist's quoting it in this manner, Τότε ἐπληρώθη, THEN was fulfilled that which was spoken by *Jeremy the Prophet*; and one would think it was never meant to be fulfilled more in any other Event after it; yet a *Poetical Description*, (such as that of *Jeremiah*, was of the *Bethlehem Massacre*) is then fulfilled or verified, when such an Event happens, to which it may as properly and truly be applyed, as it was to that for which it was originally intended: For in *Mr. Whiston's Divinity*, A *Poetical Description* of an Event, is a standing thing, ever ready

Jerem. 31.
15.

to be applyed likewise to any other such Events as they may happen, in any Age. So that one and the same Poetical Description may in some place or other, in one Instance or other, in one sort of Tragedy or other, be a fulfilling so long as the World lasts: For Poetick Descriptions or Lamentations, may be frequently fulfilled or verified, without any manner of Impeachment of the Person who introduces them upon the like Occasions afterwards. But ought that Person to go without any manner of Impeachment, (to give him his own Words) who has thus strangely Commented on St. Matthew's Quotation from *Jeremy*, having introduced here his new Notion of a Prophecy with a Poetical Description? For he tells us, that *Jerem. 31. 15.* is a Prophecy of a certain Event, which is withal a Poetical Description of another Event relating to the *Messias*; nay, a standing Poetical Description of all Calamitous Events whatsoever of the like sort, to the World's End. This is his Doctrine, rather than he will allow the Prophecy to relate to the *Messias* with a Double Sense, as it is a Prophecy. He says, *The Words of the Prophecy are plainly used by the Prophet originally, on occasion of the Captivity of the Jews by Nebuchadnezzar*; and that is very true: *And therefore could not properly belong to the Murther of the Infants by Herod, without the allowance of a Type.*

But

Some Prophecies of the Messias.

125

But there he is mistaken : For though the Calamity of the Captivity to *Babylon* was supposed not to be intended for a Type or Figure of the Slaughter in *Bethlehem*, yet it is plain that *Jeremiah's* Prophecy more properly belongs to the latter Tragedy of the Two ; for here are two distinct Completions of one and the same Prophecy, and the Prophecy was far more literally fulfilled in the Second Event, than in the other, as I can easily shew.

The Prophecy begins, *In Ramah was there a Voice heard, Lamentation, and bitter Weeping* : So accordingly, Herod sent forth and slew all the Children that were in *Bethlehem*, and all the Coasts thereof, from two Tears old, and under. And therefore the Weeping and Lamentation, and great Mourning, must needs extend as far as *Ramah*, the sad Voice must be heard there too ; because *Ramah* in *Benjamin*, bordered upon *Bethlehem* in *Judah*. And I observe by the way, that *Ramah*, a Place close neighbouring to *Bethlehem*, is mentioned, and not *Bethlehem* it self, that the Prophecy might appear to have some respect however to the Jewish Captivity ; since at *Ramah* it was, that the Jews were gathered together by *Nebuzaradan*, and from thence carried into Captivity in the Days of *Jeremiah*.

Matth. 2.
16.

Jer. 40. 1.

The

The Prophecy goes on, *Rachel weeping for her Children, refused to be comforted*: For *Rachel* was the Mother of the Tribe of *Benjamin*, and so of *Ramah*, a Town in *Benjamin*, on the Confines of *Judah*, to which the Slaughter of the Infants reached; and she who was a Woman extremely desirous of Children in her Life-time, is the Person brought in to represent the Tender Mothers both of *Ramah* and *Bethlehem*: For she was *Bethlehem's* Mother, inasmuch as the Children of *Bethlehem* were her Husband's Children, and so her's; she was also buried in *Bethlehem*. And they were *Children* whom this great Mourning was for, and no other are mentioned. And Lastly, The Mourning for them was because they *are not*; that is, were taken from the World. For where ever in Scripture it is said of any, that they *are not*, it is meant, according to the Scriptural Style, that they are removed out of the World, *Gen. 5. 24. & 42. 13, 22, 36.* So that the Particulars of the Prophecy were all very literally fulfilled in the Destruction of the Poor Children of *Bethlehem*, excepting the *Prosopopæia* in *Rachel*, who is brought in weeping and complaining, after she had been long dead: Nay indeed, though the Prophecy most certainly was meant of the Captivity of the *Jews*, yet the several Branches of it, as they are expressed, are not without some difficulty

Some Prophecies of the Messias.

127

applicable to that Captivity : The Prophecy is a more dark and obscure Description, as it belongs to the *Babylonish* Captivity; and in comparison, it is a plain and clear Prediction, as it belongs to the murdered Innocents.

For Instance : In the Publick Captivity of a People all Persons do weep, and not one *Rachel* only; and they weep in more Places than in a *Ramah* only; and they weep for themselves, and not for their Children only : For all sorts are led into Captivity, Young and Old, Men, Women and Children, and not Children only; and the Sufferers in that Case are not slain, but Captives only; of whom it is not so properly said in the Style of Scripture, that they are *not* : Wherefore seeing the Prophecy is manifestly more adapted in its Expressions to describe the Second, than the First Event, the Massacre than the Captivity, it is past all dispute that the Sense and Completion is double. *Q. E. D.*

There are also in the *Psalms* two other Passages relating to the *Messias*, which were Prophecies of *Judas* the Traitor, and yet first were meant of *Ahitophel* and *Doeg*; in one of which *Judas's* Treachery is foretold, in the other his Fall from the Apostleship : The former place is cited by our Saviour himself, as Prophetick, and fulfilled in the Traiterous Apostle. *John 13. 18. I speak*

*JUDAS's
Treachery
and Fall
foretold in
the Cases of
AHITO-
PHEL
and DO-
EG.*

Speak not of you all ; I know whom I have chosen ; but that the Scripture might be fulfilled, He that eateth Bread with me, hath lift up his Heel against me. Which Quotation is taken from *Psalms* 41. 9. where the Words are, *mine own familiar Friend ;* (or, which is the same in the *Hebrew*, *The Man of my Peace*) *in whom I trusted, which did eat of my Bread, hath lift up his Heel against me.* There are much the same Words in the 12th and 13th Verses of the 55th *Psalms* ; and the Jewish Masters have interpreted the Passages in both *Psalms* to be *David's* Just Complaints of *Ahitophel*, who was the exact Picture of *Judas* ; but the Quotation is from the 41st *Psalms*, and the Prophecy is only there : For *David* was an Illustrious Type of the *Messias*, and as his Troubles, and after-Advancement to the Throne, eminently prefigured the Humiliation and Exaltation of our Lord *Jesus* ; so other of his Circumstances were Typical of *Christ*. For Instance : As *David* was basely served by an Intimate Friend, a Man of his Peace, whom he often admitted to his Table, and never quarrell'd with ; so the same hard measure should our Lord find from one of his own Apostles, whom he had chosen ; and so the same Words of the *Psalms* were meant literally of *Ahitophel*, prophetically of *Judas*. The other Double-sensed Prophecy in the *Psalms* concerning

cerning Judas, is a Prediction, that he should be turned off from the Apostolical Office, and lose that Honour, and a better Man should have it in his room; and that Place is cited by St. Peter, *Acts 1. 20.* For it is written in the Book of the Psalms, *Let his Habitation be desolate, and his Bishoprick let another take:* Which is a Quotation from *Psalms 109. 8.* where the Words are, *Let his Days be few, and let another take his Office:* For these Words are part of David's Direful Imprecation against Doeg the Edomite, Saul's Servant, whose Mischievous and Villanous Information against Abimelech, to raise himself at Court, caused Abimelech, and the Priests of the Lord to be slain; nay Doeg himself slew them at Saul's Command. David therefore repeats the Prophecy, that God would avenge the Cause of his Priests in the Murtherer's Destruction: For this the Psalmist foretold, not only by way of solemn Cursing him in the 109th Psalm, but also by a plain Threatning and Denunciation of the Sorest Judgment upon him, in the 52d Psalm; *Why boastest thou thy self in mischief, O mighty man? the goodness of God endureth continually; thy tongue deviseth mischiefs like a sharp Razor, working deceitfully; thou lovest evil more than good, and lying, rather than to speak righteousness; thou hast loved all devouring words, O thou deceitful tongue; God shall*

shall likewise destroy thee far ever, he shall take thee away, and pluck thee out of thy dwelling-place, and root thee out of the Land of the living: The Righteous also shall see and fear, and shall laugh at him: Lo, this is the man that made not God his strength, but trusted in the abundance of his Riches, and strengthened himself in his Wickedness. And most certainly the Cruel and Insufferable Wretch was signally cut off some way or other, and made a notable Example of Vengeance, though in what particular manner we read not; and no doubt his Family also was rooted out. Now this wicked Doeg was the chiefest of the Herdsmen that belonged to Saul, as we read 1 Sam. 21. 7. and we may observe, that in allusion to Doeg's Office of being chief of the Overseers of Saul's Herds and Cattel, St. Peter speaks of Judas's Office of an Apostle, as an Episcopacy likewise, and calls both Offices Bishopricks, Τὸν Ἐπισκοπικὸν ἀντὶς, his Bishoprick let another take. Wherefore the Prophetical Imprecation, Let his Days be few, and let another take his Office, was to be verif'd both in Doeg and Judas, who had both their Bishopricks, or Præfectures, though of very different kinds; and in the same Words of Prophecy it was foretold, that the one should be removed from the Office of chief Herdsman, the other from that of the Apostleship.

Some Prophecies of the Messias.

131

So likewise there are three such Prophetic Scriptures more, which we find quoted together in the Second Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Verses 11, 12, 13. For both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one : For which cause he is not ashamed to call them Brethren ; saying, I will declare thy Name unto my Brethren, and in the midst of the Church will I sing Praise unto thee ; And again, Behold, I and the Children, which God hath given me : For this is David's Testimony concerning himself ; I will declare thy Name unto my Brethren, in the midst of the Congregation will I praise thee, Psalm 22. 22. And Isaiah speaks of himself, where he says, I will wait upon the Lord, that he will look for him ; Behold, I and the Children, whom the Lord hath given me, are for signs and for wonders in Israel, Isa. 8. 17, 18. And yet the Apostle to the Hebrews represents David and Isaiah to be Typical Prophets in these Expressions, as speaking not of themselves only, but in the Person of Christ ; as if Christ in their Words had prophesied to this effect ; " I will preach and publish in the midst of the World by my Apostles, all the Parts and Passages of my Undertaking for Man ; my Incarnation, Miracles, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and Intercession to the Glory of God the Father, and to the praise of the Glory

Expressions
used by
DAVID
and ISAI-
AH con-
cerning
themselves,
and in the
Person of
CHRIST
too.

Ephes. 1. 6.
Phil. 2. 11.

" of

"of his Grace; and I will trust God hearti-
 ly, that he will finish that Work he hath
 sent me into the World for, by enabling
 me to plant a Church therein, notwith-
 standing all the Opposition I shall meet
 with from *Jews and Heathens*; and be-
 hold, I and my Apostles and Followers
 are for Signs and Wonders to the World.
 From which Three Scriptures the Apostle
 proves the Union between *Christ* and his
 Church; to wit, that *he that sanctifieth,*
and they who are sanctified, are all of one; as
 being united by the same Common Nature
 into one Body; since in the first of those
 Texts our Lord calls his Disciples his *Bre-*
thren; in the Second he owns himself to be
 One of our Nature, by declaring his Trust
 in God, and dependance upon his Help and
 All-sufficiency in all Difficulties and Adver-
 sities; and in the Third he calls his Church
 in the World, his *Children* whom God
 hath given him, as the Prophet *Isaiah*
 calls the Christian Church the *Seed* of
Christ.

Isa. 53. 10.

The first
 Promise of
 the MES-
 SIAS gi-
 ven in a
 Double
 Sense.

In the last place, even the Original Pre-
 diction of the *Messias*, which was very ob-
 scure at so vast a distance from his Coming
 is another Scripture that may be ranked
 with those places I have put together
 Says God to the Serpent, after the Fall
 of our First Parents, *Adam and Eve*, I will
 put Enmity between thee and the Woman, and
 between

between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise
thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel, Gen.
3. 15. Which Words were a Threat'ning to
the Serpent, but Matter of great Comfort
to Lapsed Man. And here a Double
Sense is so very manifest, a Literal and My-
thical Meaning so clearly distinct, that I
need not use many Words to shew the Du-
plicity : The Seed of the Woman is the
Race of Mankind, and the Seed of the Wo-
man is the *Messias* ; the Serpentine and Hu-
man Kind are extremely odious to one
another : There is an Irreconcilable En-
mity between Christ and the Devil, between
the Church of Christ, and the Powers of
Darkness ; The Serpent being condemned
to go upon his Belly, and crawl on the
earth, his Head is e'en as low as Man's
Heel, and therefore a Serpent's Head may
be bruised by a Man's Heel ; but a Serpent
cannot easily bruise, or bite, or sting a Man,
except in his Heel, or Inferior Parts. A
Serpent that goes upon his Belly, and not
erect, is not well fitted in that Posture to
reach the upper parts of a Man, or to make
his Assault there : And so the Devil, who
seduced Man by the Serpent, is a Noxious
Enemy to the Seed of the *Messias* ; but,
blessed be God, all the Mischief he can do
to the Church of Christ, is no more than
that bears proportion to a Bruise in a
Man's Heel, when his Head and Vital
Parts

Parts are whole and untouch'd. And the time is coming, when *the works of the Devil* shall be quite destroyed by the Son of God, and God shall one Day *bruise Satan under our Feet*, as the Apostle expresses it, *Rom. 16. 20.*

Thus have I produced out of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, various Prophecies of the *Messias*, or Prophecies at least relating to him, which do clearly carry with them a Duplicity of Sense. And now I leave Mr. *Whiston* to judge, whether he had reason to say, that *Double Senses and Typical Interpretations* are NEVER TO BE PROVED BY CHRISTIANS. I conceive they are abundantly proved : And there is another thing also which may be proved by Christians ; *viz.* That it were best there should be some Prophecies of that sort, besides the other : Which was the

Second thing I undertook to shew.

*Duplicity
of Sense in
some Pro-
phesies, best
and fittest.*

Indeed it may be thought there was hardly any need of making this a distinct Head ; because if there are divers such Prophecies, it was certainly best that such Prophecies there should be. Mr. *Whiston* seems to laugh at Double Senses, as if no such things could be allowed of by Wise Men, and he is pleased to represent them as Mistakes of a pernicious Nature. He says, they are Hind'rances of *free Reasoning upon the Prophetick Writings*, Obstacles and

Stum-

Stumbling-Blocks lying in the way of the Conversion of the Jews ; nay, he calls them *Frauds and Sophisms*, and what not ? And he cannot forbear disparaging Commentators, as very silly Persons, for interpreting any Prophecies that way : And yet after all, it is most certain, that there are such Prophecies, as I have fully proved and demonstrated. And if there be, as I think sufficiently appears, I hope Mr. *Whiston* will not take upon him to be wiser than God, or to offer to mend the Divine Methods of foreshewing the *Messias* to the World. For if it be greatly manifest, that in some of the Prophecies there is a Duplicity of Sense and Intention, all that he says in Contempt of Double-Sens'd Prophecy, to have that Doctrine exploded, is but reflecting upon the Wisdom of God. But, as the Apostle speaks, *Let God be true, and every* Rom. 3. 4 *man a Liar* ; in like manner say I, Let God be All-wise, and somebody not altogether so wise, as he takes himself to be. Whatever God does, it is doubtless best and fittest to be done, though we are not always able to see into the Reasons of what he does : but it is not difficult to account for the Divine Wisdom in the Particular before us. And truly Mr. *Whiston* is as much out, in telling us there ought to be no Double-Sens'd Prophecies of the *Messias*, as in affirming that there are none ; and he disco-

vers no less want of Judgment by the former Pretence, than of Knowledge in the Scriptures by the latter.

*The Testi-
mony of
Prophecy
strengthened
by the va-
rious ways
of Prophe-
cy.*

This only I would learn of him, whether *the Testimony of Jesus in the Spirit of Prophecy*, be not much stronger, supposing there are various ways of foretelling him to the World, than if he was foretold only in one way of Prophecy? For my part, I cannot but observe, what abundant Care the Infinitely Wise God hath taken, to prepare the World for the Faith of *Jesus*, by all kind and manner of Prophecies concerning him.

*Histor.
Lib. 5.
Sect. 3.*

For Instance. He is foretold not only in Prophecies directly meaning Events concerning him, but in Prophecies mixed with other Concerns: Not only in Predictions which speak singly and only of him, but in Predictions where others are joined with him. Not only in Prophecy among the *Jews*; but the *Gentiles* also; for which we have the Authority of *Tacitus*. Not only in Prophecies where Good Men, but also where Bad Ones are made the Instruments of the Divine Spirit, in foretelling things concerning *Christ*: For he was prophesied of by such ill Persons as *Balaam* and *Cyprias*. Not only in the proper Verbal Predictions, but also in Predictions by Things. For the State of the *Jewish Temple*, and great part of the Service there, were (if

may so speak) Predictions by Things, as the Scriptures of the Prophets were in Words : And not only in Words, and by Things, but in Persons also ; for some of the Eminent Patriarchs and *Israelites*, were Types of *Christ*. That is to say, God of his Great Wisdom, to imply the Vastness of the Concern, and to shew his great care for planting Christianity in the World, and to leave Unbelievers the more inexcusable, hath foretold *Christ* by all manner of Prophecy, by every way that was apt to strike the Mind of Man.

Now Double-Sens'd Prophecies, and the Single ones, being part of that Admirable Variety, surely it was better for the farther strength'ning of our Faith, that some of the Prophecies should be of the former sort, and not all of the latter. And I have often considered these two distinct ways of Prophecy of the *Messias*, with exceeding Satisfaction and Delight ; and do find I am in no danger of being robb'd of the Pleasure of so Entertaining a Contemplation, by any of Mr. *Whiston's* Arguings against this Variety in Prophecy. Besides, by those Prophecies of the *Messias* of the Double Kind, the Prophectic Spirit is shewn to have been more intent upon the *Messias*, than if there had been no other Prophecies of him, but where he is spoken of singly. When I often think of a Person, and singly he is the Subject of my

O 3

Thoughts

Thoughts from time to time, it is certain my Mind runs upon that Person ; but if when I think of some other Persons, still he is uppermost with me ; nay, if at the time I had not admitted them into my Thoughts at all, but purely upon his Account, and for that Reason do join both together in the same Idea and Conception, this argues in me still a greater fixedness of Mind upon that Person, than if I never thought of him, but by himself alone. Even so from those Prophecies of the *Messias* with a Double Sense which we find in Scripture, it is still more apparent that the *Messias* is the Great Subject of the Old Testament, and of the Holy Ghost in it, than if he had never been joined with any other in Prophecy, but every Prediction of him had been single; especially if the Persons with whom he is joined in Prophecy, had never been made the Subject of Prophecy at all, but only with Relation to him, that they might serve for preparatory Emblems and Figures of the Great Matters to be at length most illustriously verified and accomplished in him.

DoubleSenses in Prophecy, no hindrances of the Conversion of the Jews,

And as it was best that there should be Double-Sens'd Prophecies of the *Messias*, besides the Single ones, so take the Prophecies of the *Messias* in the Old Testament, as we have them there, the Doctrine of Double Senses is very needful for the
Expli-

Explication of divers of them, that the Jews may be Converted by them.

Mr. *Whiston* is quite of another Mind: He fancies, that could his Scheme of the Prophecies hold; that is, could it be made out, as he thinks he has done, that every Prophecy of the *Messias* is Single, the Prophecies would be of far more use for converting and proselyting Infidels: For against the Notion of Prophecies of the *Messias* with a Double Sense, he objects this Inconvenience. *If this Double Intention in Prophecies be allowed by us Christians, as to those Predictions which were to be fulfilled in our Saviour Christ; and if we own that we can no otherwise shew their Completion, than by applying them secondarily and typically to our Lord, after they had in their first and primary Intention been already plainly fulfilled in the Times of the Old Testament, We lose all the real Advantage of these Ancient Prophecies, as to the Proof of our Common Christianity, and besides expose our selves to the Insults of Jews and Infidels in our Discourses with them. This Consideration ought to go very near the Heart of all such as firmly believe the Truth of our Holy Religion, and are in earnest desirous of the spreading and Propagation of it to the rest of the World; especially to those of the Jewish Nation, whose Conversion we ought chiefly to endeavour after.* P. 16.

This is an Amazing Paragraph : Surely the Author doth not Reason, but Dream : He delivers this Objection with all the Gravity and Seriousness imaginable ; nay, he would have the thing he complains of go very near our Hearts, and yet there is nothing at all in what he says.

The Jews
no Stran-
gers to
Double
Senses in
Prophecy.

For there can be no Sense in his Arguing after this manner, unless it be supposed that the *Jews* disallow Double Senses, as much as himself does. But that is not true : They allow of Great Mysteries in their Law, and of Great * Mysteries in several Passages of the Old Testament, with respect to the *Messias* ; and they are no Strangers to Typical Interpretations of Scriptures in a Second Sense ; and hardly any thing is more common in *Jewish* Divinity.

By the way then I cannot but note, that this Christian Divine plainly diserves that Cause that he pretends to preach and write for ; inasmuch as he helps the *Jews* to an Argument against the Faith of Christianity, and puts an Objection into their Mouths, which for ought I know, they never thought of, I am sure they never so much as offered to use against Christians. But the Comfort is, I am persuaded that the *Jews* are wiser than to thank him for it, and would be ashamed

* Bishop Kidder's *Demonstrat. of the Messias*. Part I. p. 309.

to urge it upon his Authority, though they might take Occasion so to do from his Book ; I rather think that they would blame his Ignorance, and complain that he * misrepresents them. The chief Expositor among the Jews divides Balaam's Prophecy, *Numb.* 24. 17. between David and the Messias ; so *2 Sam.* 7. 13. as likewise

* Bishop Patrick's Comment on the Place in Numbers, p. 490. *Myſticè de Meſſià interpretatur & Maimonides, cujus ſummam victoriam omnes veteres victoriæ adumbrarunt. Synopſis Critic. in locum, Vol. 1. Pars prior, p. 715. De Solomone & de Chriſto hic agitur ex Judæorum quorundam confeſſione apud Aug. de Solomone literaliter, de Chriſto allegoricè accipiendum docent Hebræi, & rectè. Synopſ. in 2 Sam. 7. 13. Vol. 1. pars poſter. p. 295. R. D. Kimchi expounds the Second *Pſalm*, of David, but yet he owns that their Rabbins, by the Lord's Anointed, meant King Meſſias. Biſhop Kidder's Demons. of the Meſſias, Part 2. p. 309. David Kimchi *Pſalmum Secundum tùm de Davide, tùm de Meſſià exponit. Grotius in Matthæum* 1. 22. p. 12. Many of the Hebrews themſelves apply the 21ſt *Pſalm* to the Meſſias ; Biſhop Patrick's Argument of the 21ſt *Pſalm*, p. 143. De objecto *Pſalmi* 22. *Ode hæc Davidis Proſugi calamitates deſcribit, ſenſu tamen ſublimiore Meſſiam reſpicit, quod & Hebræorum Scholia quæ Midras vocant ad hunc locum indicant : Synop. in objectum Pſalmi* 22. Vol. 2. Pars prior. p. 676. Argumentum *Pſalmi* 72. *Hac ſolenni precationis formâ, quam etiam populo præſcripſit David filium Deo commendat, rogans ut ipſum inſtruat verâ pietate, & prudentiâ, &c. Sublimiori tamen ſenſu pertinere hæc ad Meſſiam agnoſcunt vetus Scholiſtes Hebræus hoc loco. & R. Saadia Gaon ad Dan. 7. 14. & Salomon Jarchi ; Ipſi Rabbini, qui vacillant dubii utrùm hunc Pſalmum, Chriſto attribuant an Salomoni ſententur, pleraque Salomoni convenire *אֵלֶּיךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ*, Chriſto autem ſine exceſſu & hyperbole ; K. duas expoſitiones adducit ; 1. De Solomone 2. De Chriſto, ſed huic palmam tribuit : Proprie dicitur de Chriſto, & Hyperbolicè de Salomone. Synopſ. in Argumentum *Pſalmi* 72. Vol. 2. Pars prior. p. 1023, 1024.**

wise the 2d. and the 21st. and 22d. and 72d. *Psalms*, are all Interpreted by Jewish Commentators in a Double Sense. In short, *Grotius* tells us, That the Hebrew Masters, both Ancient and Modern, do assign two Senses to many places of the Prophets.

We see then the Dispute between us and the Jews, is, not whether there be Double Senses in some Prophecies of the *Messias*,

1024. *Confessum erat inter Judæos, in nonnullis antiquis Historiis præter sensum Historicum alium eminentiorem occultari.* Synops. in Gal. 4. 24. p. 710. Imo Hebræorum Magistri & veteres & novi multis locis Prophetarum sensus duas assignant, *Grotius* in *Matthæum* 1. 22. p. 12. The Jews themselves acknowledge that the Words of the 72d. *Psalms* had not their full Accomplishment in *Solomon*, as appears by the *Chaldee-Paraphrase*, *Midrasch Tehillim*, the *Book Siphre*, and many others. *Bishop Patrick* in his Argument on the 72d. *Psalms*, p. 519. The Jewish Masters themselves think, that *Solomon* is set forth in the 72d. *Psalms*, as a Type of the *Messias*, and that these Prophecies were to have a fuller Accomplishment in a more August manner in him. *Ld. Bp. Burnet* in the beginning of his Sermon at *St. Paul's*, on the 31st. of *December*, 1706. before the Queen and the Two Houses. Last of all, I shall quote *Mr. Whiston* against himself: He tells us, p. 27. That the Fathers, and in the head of them *St. Barnabas*, do frequently make use of Types and Allusions, which they drew from the Ritual Laws of *Moses*, and from many Passages of History in the Old Testament, as *St. Paul* had done before them, in compliance perhaps with the Jewish Doctrines of those Times. Unless therefore the Doctrines of the Modern Jews be much altered, and different from the Jewish Doctrines in the Times of *St. Paul* and *St. Barnabas*, and the Fathers, Types and Allusions can be no Obstructions to the Conversion of the Jews.

for they are equally acknowledged both by Jews and Christians ; but whether the Second Senses of such Places respecting the Messias, are applicable to Jesus as fulfilled in him. And yet Mr. Whiston says, p. 18. *I believe that no small part of the Primitive Converts to Christianity, which were out of the Jews and Profelytes, who entirely owned the Old Testament for the Word of God, were made such principally by the force of this Argument, that all the old Predictions, which belong'd to the first coming of the Messias, being evidently fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth, and in no other Person ; therefore this Jesus of Nazareth was the true Messias.*

But I believe no such thing ; neither, I am sure, hath he any Reason to believe it ; because the Primitive Jewish Profelytes were Persons who held that Prophecies were fulfilled in Jesus, which had some Accomplishment before : And therefore they were not made Converts by the force of this Argument, that all the Old Predictions were fulfilled in Jesus, and in no other Person ; they were converted by the Double-Sens'd Prophecies of the Messias, as well as by the Single ones ; for they esteem'd them to be as truly and properly Prophecies of Jesus, as the other.

Neither is this all : It is so far from being true, that the Opinion of Double Interpretations, and Typical Interpretations, is a

Some Prophecies lost to the Jews without the allowance of a Double Sense in them.

Grand

- p. 13. *Grand Obstacle and Stumbling-Block in the way of the Conversion of the Jews, and exposes us to the Insults of Jews and Infidels*
- p. 16. *in our Discourses with them, (as he would make us believe) that on the contrary this Opinion is, as I have said, highly necessary in order to convert the Jews by some Prophecies, which otherwise could be of no use for that purpose, but would be utterly lost to the Jews, and they would never be brought thereby to believe that Jesus is the Christ.*

p. 40, 41. For Instance : Mr. *White*, in his Preface to his Commentary on *Isaiah*, argues very well on that Noble Prediction, *Isaiah* 7. 14. to shew Mr. *Whiston* clearly, that he can never bring the *Jews* to believe it a Prophecy of *Jesus*, his way. For should he offer to urge it to them for their Conviction with his Unity of Sense, they would certainly interrupt and trouble him, with putting to him a puzzling Question or two, which he could not readily answer, and would lay Difficulties in his way, which he could not well get over with all his Skill : And then, as to the Prophecy, (*Isaiah* 61. 1, 2.) *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good Tydings unto the meek, &c.* should the *Jews* in Discourse with Mr. *Whiston* object, that *Jesus* misapplied those Words as fulfilled in him, which *Isaiah*

spal

spal
Auth
answ
the I
Li
ble-S
ced t
Savi
Whi
Messi
woul
too.
it is
that
form
viou
dicti
val f
Plac
of L
of a
of C
Wom
phoc
Infid
I
cies
Mr.
bewa
tors,
Stre
are

spake of himself ; I do not see how our Author could come off otherwise, than by answering the *Jews*, that the beginning of the Prophecy was meant of both.

Likewise, without the Opinion of Double-Senses, the *Jews* can never be convinced that *Hosea* 11. 1. is a Prophecy of our Saviour's Return from *Egypt* : For if Mr. *Whiston* still pretends, that by *Israel* the *Messias* is to be understood there, the *Jews* would but laugh at him, and very justly too. So again, without the same Opinion, it is impossible ever to make any *Jew* think, that the *Psalms* 41. 9. and 109. 8. (the former of which Texts is quoted by our Saviour, the latter by St. *Peter*) were Predictions of *Judas's* Treachery, and Removal from his Office ; since one of those Places was meant of *Ahitophel*, the other of *Doeg*. Neither without the Allowance of a Duplicity of Sense, can those Words of God to the Serpent, *The Seed of the Woman shall bruise thy Head*, appear a Prophecy of the *Messias* to *Jews*, or any other Infidels.

I shall not instance in any more Prophecies of this kind : And therefore whereas Mr. *Whiston* with some Concern pities and bewails the Case of our Modern Expositors, telling us, that 'tis a sad and unhappy p. 17.
Streight to which they are driven, when they are to deal with the Jews, and defend the Cause

Cause of Christianity ; Why truly, his utter denying of all Double Sense in Prophecy, and quite exploding it out of Divinity, must sometimes drive him to a worse Streight a great deal, when he is to deal with *Jews*. Indeed he seems very Zealous for the Conversion of the *Jews*, but what wise Work would he make with the *Jews*, if he always went about to proselyte them according to his Principle and Hypothesis ? He himself may happen to be driven (as he says) to a *sad and unhappy Streight* in the Dispute, and to be basely worsted and gravell'd by them, and exposed to their Insults : I am confident he would find it so, if he made the Experiment : Nay, I verily think, a *Jew* would desire no better Sport, than to Encounter Mr. *Whiston* upon some Prophecies, so long as he sticks to his one determinate Sense in them.

*No danger
of a Mul-
tiplication
of Events
by Enthu-
siasts, from
the allow-
ance of
Double Sen-
ses in Pro-
phesy.*

P. 15.

He objects farther, That the Common Doctrine of Duplicity of Sense in any Prophecy, is inconvenient and pernicious upon another Account. *If Prophecies are allowed* (says he) *to have more than one Event in view at the same time, we can never be satisfied but they may have as many as any Visionary pleases ; and so instead of being capable of a direct and plain Exposition to the Satisfaction of the Judicious, will be still liable to foolish Applications of Fanciful and Enthusiastick Men.* It is very certain, that there are Prophe-

Prophecies, which had *more than one Event* in view at the same time; and yet it seems there must be none, because if there were, this great Inconvenience would follow thereupon: A fanciful Man would from thence take a liberty to multiply Events of the same Prophecies as he lists, without Reason, and without End; and we can never be satisfied but they may have as many Events in view, as any Visionary pleases.

So then, as plain as it is, that there are Prophecies which had *more than one Event* in view at the same time, nevertheless they are not to be allowed of, because of the imagined ill Consequence of that Allowance, in the Latitude it would give to *Enthusiastick Men*. And this is one of his Reflections on the Divine Wisdom, in case it be true, as most evidently it is, that there are Prophecies of that sort. But to this I Answer; Every Prophecy of the *Messias*, in whomsoever it was fulfilled before him, was *exhausted*, when it was once fulfilled in him; which is a good Expression of Mr. White's: And there is no danger of an Enthusiast's Expounding any Prophecy of the *Messias*, as meant to be fulfilled in another after him. And I pray, who of the Fanciful sort ever offered at such a thing, except the *Quakers*? For in Double-Sens'd Prophecies of the *Messias*, it is as evident that there are but Two Senses meant; and what the

Preface to
his Com-
mentary
p. 41.

the two Senses are, as it is in the single Prophecies, that there is but one Sense, and what that is. This therefore is a very vain and trifling Objection, or rather I may say, there is nothing in it.

In Double-Sens'd Prophecies the *Messias* meant not *Secondarily*, but *Primarily*.

And there is one thing more, which he doth not speak of distinctly under any one Head, or make any Objection of by it self: But I find it here and there, in his Reasonings against the Duplicity of Sense in Prophecies of the *Messias*, which is another way he has of reflecting contemptuously on that Doctrine, as not fit to be allowed; and it is this. The Prophecies of the *Messias* in those Prophetick Places, where the *Messias* is not meant singly, he is pleased to call *Secondary Senses*; applied *Secondarily to our Lord*, after they had in their first and primary Intention, been already plainly fulfilled in the Times of the Old Testament. So he loves to speak of the Completions of such Prophecies in the *Messias*; as if the first Sense must be supposed to be the chiefest, and in all the Double-Sens'd Prophecies of the *Messias*, there was nothing more than a little Glance at him only by the Bye, or a bare Typical Allusion. And likewise the *Censura* represents Expositors, as making the Prophecies of the Old Testament to relate but in a Secondary Sense to the *Messias*, and the Times of his Kingdom.

P. 16, 19,
23, 24, 25,
46, 55.

P. 12.

Numb. 1.
P. 19.

But
wrong
the D
cy, a
theref
ry Co
great
altoge
Testam
which
and t
he wa
and ru
finishe
etween
and th
ordin
Substa
affirm
ble Pro
in the
of it,
tended
As
Balaam
wid; a
in Solon
7. 14.
like;
Compl
Great
Thus a

But

But they are both very much in the wrong : It doth by no means follow, from the Doctrine of Double Senses in Prophecy, and Second Accomplishments, that therefore Divines do allow of any Secondary Completions in our Lord : That is a great Mistake : For it is certain, there is altogether as much difference between Old-Testament Accomplishments of Prophecies, which related and belonged to the *Messias*, and their Accomplishments in Him when he was come ; as there is between the first and ruder Draught of a thing, and its entire finishing in Beautiful Perfection : Or between the bare Model of a Goodly Fabrick, and the Structure it self, when raised accordingly : Or between a Shadow, and the Substance, whereof it is the Shadow. I do affirm therefore, that in every such Double Prophecy, the Second Completion, that in the *Messias*, is the main Accomplishment of it, and was vastly more meant and intended, than the other.

As for Instance ; The Completion of Balaam's Prophecy, *Numb. 24. 17.* in David ; and of David's Prophecy, *Psalms 72.* in Solomon ; and of *Isaiah's* Prophecy, *Isaiah 7. 14.* in *Maher-sbalal-hash-baz*, and the like ; were nothing in Comparison to the Completions of those Prophecies in the Great *Messias*, to whom they all refer'd. Thus as to the Prophecy, *Isaiah 61. 1, 2.*

in particular; *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good Tydings, &c.* when our Lord read it to the Jews in one of their Synagogues, he told them, *This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your Ears*; that is, in comparison, those Words were meant of no other Person but himself, and the Prophecy was never fulfilled before at all in any other. In a word, The Second Accomplishments of any Prophecies in our Lord, which were any way fulfilled in others before, were the Primary ones, and First in the Original Intention of God. And the first Accomplishments of any such Prophecies were in the same Divine Intention, but Secondary, and had only a subordinate Reference to their after Gradual Completions in *Jesus Christ*.

I proceed in the

III^d. Place, to the rest of Mr. *Whiston*'s Arguments against all Double-Sense in Prophecy. He says he must be somewhat particular in the Demonstration of this Observation, *That the Stile and Language of the Prophets is always Single and Determinate, and not capable of those Double-Intentions and Typical Interpretations, which most of our late Christian Expositors are so full of upon all Occasions.* Every Argument the Mathematical Professor uses, and all that he says, Demons-

Demonstration ; but this I will say, That if he was no better at Demonstrating in the Mathematicks, than he is in Divinity, the University of Cambridge would hardly have advanced him to the Honour of a Professorship in that Noble Science.

Now to come to his other Wond'rous Demonstrations, besides those I have already refuted, they are Three : For he pretends to shew,

1. That more than one Sense in a Prophecy is Unnatural.
2. That there are not the least Footsteps of such a thing as a Double-Sense of a Prophecy, in the Writings of the Evangelists and Apostles.
3. That the Fathers are utter Strangers to it.

1. *A Single and Determinate Sense of every Prophecy, is the only Natural and Obvious one, and no more can be admitted, without putting a force upon plain Words ; and no more consented to by the Minds of inquisitive Men, without a mighty Byass upon their Rational Faculties.* That is, says he, 'Tis natural to take every Prophecy in a single and determinate Sense, and they who do otherwise, and so put a force upon plain Words, are either ignorant or prejudiced ; they are either not inquisitive Men, or they have a mighty Byass upon their Rational Faculties.

A Double Sense in one and the same Prophecy, not Unnatural.

p. 13, 14.

Which is but a confident Assertion, and is bare saying without proving ; and the thing is not true, merely because he says it. He would fain have us take for granted, that a *single and determinate Sense is the only Natural and Obvious one, and no more can be admitted, without putting a force upon plain Words.*

This is true indeed of some Prophecies, which were intended to be understood in a Single Sense, and very plainly express'd to be so understood ; but in other Prophecies a Double Sense is *natural and obvious enough*, as I have shewn at large. At least, if both Senses of some of those Places be not equally obvious at first sight, however the Second Sense is discovered, and the Duplicity plainly appears, upon due Enquiry. And I must take leave to tell Mr. *Whiston* plainly, that to restrain a Double-Sens'd Prophecy to a Single Sense, is as faulty a *force upon plain Words*, as to put upon a Single-Sens'd Prophecy a Double one ; and he must needs know himself not to be a little guilty of that Fault.

For Instance ; His making all the 8th Psalm to belong to the *Messias* ; his denying the same Person to be spoken of in the 15th and 16th Verses of the 7th Chapter of *Isaiah*, who was the Subject of the Prophecy in the 14th Verse foregoing ; his interpreting *Israel*, *Hosea* 11. 1. to be the

Messias, and other of his corrupt Glosses on the like Prophecies; are Notorious Forces upon plain Words, for avoiding the plain Double-Sense that is in those Prophecies.

This I am sure of, If he were truly an Inquisitive Person, without a mighty Byass upon his Rational Faculty, he would never have put Forces upon plain Words, nor perverted Scripture after so shameful a manner as he has done. Since he promised Demonstration in Proof of an Unity of Sense in all Prophecy, one might justly have expected that his first Argument for that purpose, should have been very forcible; but alas! *Parturiunt Montes*, he begins and goes on alike, and his Plain Reasons are all of a piece.

2. This Double-Sense of the Ancient Prophecies, has not the least Footsteps in the Writings of the Apostles and Evangelists. And he says, The Four Evangelists alone quote about Fifty Texts of the Old Testament, to prove that our Lord was the True Messias, without the least hint or suspicion, as far as appears, that those Predictions belonged to any other Person, or could be supposed to have had any other Completion. This Observation is so true, that I cannot recollect the least Example amongst the Apostles and Evangelists, of any one of them Countenancing this Double-Sense of any Ancient Prophecies.

DoubleSense in Prophecy, allowed of in the Writings of the New Testament.

p. 18.

p. 21.

Well, as true as he thinks his Observati-
on to be, I shall on the contrary shew a
very discernible and observable Footstep of
the Duplicity of Sense in Prophecy, being
allowed of by the Writers of the New Te-
stament ; and it is this. When they quote
any Prophecy, that had some Completion
in Old-Testament-Days, but did not re-
ceive its full Completion till *Jesus* came,
they are very careful to distinguish between
that part of the Prophecy which belongs
to *Jesus*, and that which does not ; by lea-
ving out that part of the Prophecy in which
Jesus is not concerned ; or by breaking off,
and stopping when they come to it, and
going on no farther with that Prophecy.
This evidently appears to any one that is
Conversant in the Writings of the New
Testament, and attentively reads them:
And of this it will suffice to give Four
plain Instances.

When St. *Matthew* quoted the Prophecy
of *Isaiah*, ch. 7. v. 14. applying it to the
Miraculous Birth of our Saviour, he says,
Matth. 1. That it might be fulfilled which was spoken of
the Lord by the Prophet, saying, Behold a Vir-
gin shall be with Child, and shall bring forth a
Son, and they shall call his Name Emmanuel ;
which being interpreted, is, God with us ;
there he stopp'd : He did not go on with
the other part of the Prophecy, *Butter and*
Honey shall he eat, that he may know to re-
fuse

use the evil, and to chuse the good ; For before the Child shall know to refuse the evil, and chuse the good, the Land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her Kings : Because the citing of the rest of the Prophecy had not been pertinent to his Design. Now this is a plain Indication, that St. Matthew did own two Senses in that Prophecy of the *Messias* ; forasmuch as he took no notice of, but left out that part of it concerning the Child *Immanuel*, which belonged only to *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*, and not at all to our Saviour.

Likewise St. Paul to the *Hebrews* observing, that unto Angels God hath not put in Subjection the World to come, and intending to quote a Prophecy that Both Worlds should be subject to Christ, brings in the *Psalmist*, saying, *What is man that thou art mindful of him! &c. Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet* : None excepted, as says the Apostle ; which being never yet seen to be true of Man, was to be true only of God-Man, the Lord *Jesus Christ*. And here, as I have observed, the Apostle in his Quotation from the *Psalmist*, proceeds no farther than those Words, *Thou hast put all things under his feet* : For, if he had gone on with the *Psalmist*, *All Sheep and Oxen, yea, and the Beasts of the Field, &c.* as the *Psalmist* limits and restrains the *All things* to the Terrestrial Animals, his

Citation of those Words had been to no purpose ; because then he had quite spoiled the Prophecy of *Christ* there. Wherefore this is a clear Footstep of the Apostle's allowing of two Senses in the Prophecy, *Thou hast put all things under his feet* ; the one respecting *Man*, the other *Christ* : Which two Instances in the New Testament, the former and this, are exactly alike.

So in like manner St. *Matthew* quotes *Hosea's* Prophecy, *ch. 11. v. 1.* applying it to our Saviour's being brought back from
 Matth. 2. *Egypt* in his Infancy, *Out of Egypt have I*
 1. *called my Son* : He doth not say, *That it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying, When Israel was a Child, I loved him, and I called my Son out of Egypt* ; for that had been very improper. Here then in *Hosea 11. 1.* the former part of the Verse is struck off by the Evangelist in the Quotation, because it could not be pertinently quoted to be applied to *Christ* ; just as in the two foregoing Instances, the remainder of the Prophecy of *Immanuel* in the 15th and 16th Verses of the 7th Chapter of *Isaiah*, and the Words of the 8th *Psalms* immediately next to the Prophecy in the 6th Verse there, are left out of the Quotations in *Matth. 2.* and *Hebr. 2.* for the same Reason. Surely therefore St. *Matthew* appears

to have had some Notion of a Double-Sense in this Prophecy of *Christ, Out of Egypt have I called my Son* ; since he lets the beginning of *Hosea* *II. 1.* alone, and only quotes the latter Words of the Verse ; and why ? The Prophecy lay only there, even because those Words belonged both to the *Israelites* and to *Christ*, being Matter of History with respect to them, and of Prophecy as meant of Him.

•Nay, our very Saviour doth most plainly intimate a Double-Sense ^{of himself} ~~of himself~~ in one Prophecy ; to wit, in that which he read in a Synagogue of the *Jews*, when Luke 4. he opened the Book of *Isaiah*, saying, *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the Captives, and recovering of sight to the blind ; to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord* : For when he had read thus far, *he closed the Book* ; he read no farther, because he was no farther concern'd ; and the rest that follows did not belong to him at all.

He was not to proclaim that *Vengeance of God which immediately follows* ; *Love was the great Message he was sent on, that God had laid aside his Anger, and would be reconciled to Mankind*, as Mr. *White* well observes : *Comment upon the Place, p. 428.*
Nor was he Inspired, and sent as *Isaiah* was,

to prophesy to the Jews, that after their Mourning 70 Years in *Babylon*, they should have *Beauty for Ashes*, and their waste Cities should be repaired, and Aliens made to serve them: For these Events were past and gone when our Lord came into the World; and therefore they could not be the Subject-Matter of that Prophecy and Message, to which he was anointed by the Spirit.

Let but these Four Places be laid together, and well considered, and then it must be granted, that in the New Testament there are manifest Footsteps of a Double-Sense in some Ancient Prophecies.

Nothing in
the Eu-
nuch's
Question,
against
DoubleSen-
ses in Pro-
phesy.

P. 26.

Acts 8. 34,
&c.

And yet nevertheless Mr. *Whiston* is not content only to affirm, that the *Double-Sense of the ancient Prophecies has not the least Footsteps in the Writings of the Apostles and Evangelists*, without instancing also in one Apostle, who, as he thinks, quite discountenances all Double-Senses of Ancient Prophecies; and he is *St. Philip*; for which he quotes *Acts 8. who was sent to join himself to the Chariot of the Eunuch of Candace, Queen of the Ethiopians, as he was reading the 53d. Chapter of Isaiah; and the Eunuch asked him, Of whom the Prophet was speaking, of Himself, or of some other Man? Rightly judging, that it could not be in a Double Sense, both of Himself, and some other Man, as our Modern Expositors could have supposed. Philip immediately confirms him in his Notion,*

and

and allowing it to be absurd to imagine two different Persons referr'd to in one Prophecy, opened his Mouth, and without any Enquiry after a Person under the Old Testament, to whom the Words might be in the first place applicable, began at the same Scripture, and directly therefrom preached unto him Jesus.

Certainly a Man has a miserable Cause to serve, and must be lamentably put to't to make out his Point; nay, forced to catch at any thing that seems in the least to make for him, who can allow himself to argue at this strange rate: For the place of Scripture, which the *Ethiopian* Eunuch happened to be reading, when *Philip* ran to him, and concerning which he asked the Apostle, *I pray thee, of whom speaketh the Prophet this? Of himself, or of some other Man?* was a Single Prophecy, as he truly apprehended, for the *Messias* was only meant in it: Therefore accordingly the Apostle confirms him in his right Notion of that particular Prophecy, by preaching to him from it *Jesus*, and him only; for none but He was meant in it.

But what if the Eunuch had happened to have been found reading a Double-Sens'd Prophecy of the *Messias*? viz. this for Instance: *The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good Tydings unto the meek, &c.* and had put the same Question to the Apostle;
I pray

I pray thee, of whom speaketh the Prophet this? of himself, or of some other Man? Doubtless the Apostle would have preached Jesus to him, from such a kind of Prophecy, after another manner, and would have answered him, that in these Words the Prophet spake indeed of himself, but principally of Jesus.

p. 45.

He observes likewise, that *the Evangelists do never quote any Prophecies, which by their Prefaces appear to have concerned Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, Zorobabel, Hezekiah, Josiah, or the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Egyptians, Chaldeans, Tyrians, or any of the other Neighbour-Nations.* Now grant it be so, yet I observe that one of the Apostles, to wit, St. Paul, quotes a Prophecy of the *Messias* from a Chapter in *Haggai*, which appears to have concerned *Zerubbabel*, *Hagg. 2. 7. Hebr. 12. 26.* And the same Apostle quotes a Prophecy of the Christian Church in another place, which appears to have concerned the *Edomites*, *Malac. 1. 2, 3. Rom. 9. 11, 12, 13.* as I have shewn at large in the *Preface*.

CAIA-
PHAS's
Prophecy of
Christ's
Death,
Counsel as
well as
Prophecy.

But what if that were really true, which I have shewn to be false; viz. That in the Writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, there are not the least Footsteps of this Double-Sense of any of the Ancient Prophecies? I am sure there is more than a Footstep of a Double-Sense in the latest Pro-

Prophecy of *Christ*, even in a Prophecy concerning him, which was given forth when he was come, and was now actually in the World: For one of the Evangelical Writers, *viz.* St. *John*, takes a particular Notice of a Double-Sense there; to wit, in *Caiaphas's* Prophecy, that *Jesus* should die a Sacrifice for the World; For what *Caiaphas* said to the *Jews* in these Words, *John* 11. *Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the People, and that the whole Nation perish not,* was both Prophecy and Advice. For, as he spake this by way of Counsel to the *Jews*, (and he intended no farther) he spake it of himself; but as it was a Prophecy, he spake it not of himself, but from God, who was pleased to over-rule the Mind and Words of a bad Man in that sort, as to make him an Instrument of foretelling the Great Sacrifice of the Death of *Christ*: And this spake he not of himself, but being High-Priest that Year, he prophesied that *Jesus* should die for that Nation, and not for that Nation only, but that also he should gather together in one, the Children of God that were scattered abroad. For there was a Meaning in *Caiaphas's* Words, which he himself neither understood, nor intended: In respect of which it was said by St. *John*, that he spake not of himself, but prophesied; So then *Caiaphas* had his Meaning in the Words

p. 219.

Words he uttered ; and God had his Meaning too, another Meaning, which the Expression would bear ; and so far what *Caiaphas* said, was of Divine Direction and Inspiration. And therefore I marvell'd to find *Caiaphas's* Prophecy in Mr. *Whiston's* Book, and wondered how he durst quote it. For this Prophecy, one would have thought, was a *Noli me tangere*, not to be meddled with by him. And indeed he does but just touch upon it ; he flubbers it over, and dismisses it presently, without observing against his own Hypothesis, *that* Duplicity of Sense in the Prophecy, which lay so very plainly before him.

Isa. 53. 4.
a Double-
Sensed Pro-
phesy con-
cerning
Christ.

Finally : Whereas it is one of Mr. *Whiston's* Objections against Double-Senses in Ancient Prophecy, that the Apostles and Evangelists are utter Strangers thereto, and there are no Footsteps of that Duplicity to be found in the Writings of the New Testament ; I answer to him farther, This is not true : Because there is a certain Ancient Prophecy, quoted from *Isaiah* by St. *Matthew*, which, if the Prophet and Evangelist be compared, hath most plainly a Double-Sense, as is evident from the Testimony of the Evangelist, if he be right in the Interpretation of it. Only this Prophecy is of a different sort from all the other Double-Sens'd Prophecies of the *Messias* I have mentioned, in that here none else is joined

joined with the *Messias* in the Duplicity, but the Prophecy is only and wholly of him, and the different Senses are both concerning him. The Prophecy is *Isaiah* 53. 4. *Surely he hath born our griefs, and carried our sorrows* : Which St. *Matthew* quotes in these Words, *Himself took our Infirmities, and bare our Sicknesses*, *Matth.* 8. 17. And so the two distinct Senses of the Prophecy are these : Our Lord bore our Griefs, and carried our Sorrows, by dying a Sacrifice for the Sins of the World ; and Himself took the Infirmities, and bare the Sicknesses of Men, Women, and Children, in the Days of his *Flesh*, by his Healing Miracles.

Now Mr. *Whiston* complains, that Expositors do put a Sense of their own devising, upon the Words of this Prophecy, and then as it were excuse and apologize for the Apostle's misapplication of them; and if they allow that in some remote and secondary Sense, they may signify as the Apostle applies them ; that is the utmost of their Hopes or Attempts on his Account. So that in Reality, where St. *Matthew* thought he had found a true and forcible Argument for the Proof of our Religion, our Expositors meet with no small Objection against it ; while they allow that the Apostle's Reasoning does little less than impose upon his Readers, and that he uses in a manner a false and Sophistical Argument for their Conviction. And

And here we are something in the Dark, and it is pretty hard to understand what he means: For he is not pleased to let us know, but has only left us to guess what that Sense of Expositors is, which they have devised, and put upon the Prophet's Words, and how they *Excuse and Apologize* for the *Apostle's misapplication of them*; and how it appears that *they allow that the Apostle's Reasoning does little less than impose upon his Readers, and that he uses in a manner a false and Sophistical Argument for their Conviction.* And what is his own Sense of this Prophecy, and how himself solves the Difficulty: And I think indeed it is not mightily for the *Edification of Christ's Church*, that he should blame Expositors for misinterpreting a Prophecy which he says nothing to, himself, nor offers in the least to explain.

Mr. WHISTON
declines reconciling
Isa. 53. 4.
with Matt.
8. 17.

He adds, *Surely it were better for Interpreters to own their Ignorance in some particular Places, than to venture on such a Procedure as this is; and rather to leave a few Texts to the Enquiries of future Ages, than by a bold Hypothesis of their own devising, to expose themselves and our Holy Religion, to the Laughter of Infidels.* And truly he himself hath done according to the Advice he gives to Expositors; for he seems to own his Ignorance in this particular place; and, as if it were not proper to be looked into and explained in these Days, he leaves it to

the Enquiries of future Ages : But however, I will undertake the Explication of this Prophecy, which it seems he declines, and cares not to meddle with ; and in giving its true and intended Sense, I shall vindicate the Apostle in his applying it to the Miracles of *Christ* ; and so shall shew that he needs no Excuse or Apology for Misapplication of it ; and such Exposition thereof Mr. *Whiston* may despise, as a Sense of my own devising, if he pleases.

The Subject of the Prophecy of the 53^d. Chapter of *Isaiah* concerning *Christ*, is Two-fold ; viz. His Miracles, and His Sufferings. The latter are indeed the Great Subject of the Prophecy, but it begins with the former ; *Who hath believed our Report, and to whom is the Arm of the Lord revealed ?* Where, as by Report we are to understand the Doctrine of the *Messias*, so by the ARM of the Lord we are to understand his Miracles ; which are therefore called *the Arm of the Lord*, because they are the Testimonies of his Almighty Power. Thus when the Apostles prayed for Boldness to speak the Word of the Lord, they prayed that God would grant to them by stretching forth his HAND to HEAL : These Words therefore, *Who hath believed our Report, and to whom is the Arm of the Lord revealed ?* are a plain Prophecy of the Incredulity of the *Jews*, not-

The Beginning of the Prophecy of Isaiah 53. Expounded.

Acts 4.30.

withstanding the many Wonderful Divine Works that should be wrought amongst them for their Conviction.

Now we are to observe, that the Miracles of our Saviour were mostly of the Beneficial and Charitable sort; they were Miracles of Mercy to the afflicted in Body; that is, they were healing Mens Diseases, and curing them of their Bodily Ails and Grievs. This Observation being premis'd, if we compare those Prophetick Words in the 4th Verse, *Surely he hath born our Grievs, and carried our Sorrows*, with the Prediction of a Divine stretched-out Arm in the first; then the Evangelist's Citation will be easily accounted for, and we cannot well miss of his intended Meaning in it. *Who hath believed our Report, and to whom is the Arm of the Lord revealed? That is, Who hath given Credit to a Revelation confirmed by mighty Miracles, as though the Miraculous Arm in the Signs and Wonders wrought by Christ, had not been revealed at all? For he shall grow up before him as a tender Plant, and as a Root out of a dry Ground; he hath no Form nor Comeliness, and when we shall see him, there is no Beauty that we should desire him: He is despised and rejected of Men, a Man of Sorrows, and acquainted with Grief. That is, his Miracles, the Arm of the Lord, should not be valued, but overlook'd; and notwithstanding*

V. 2, 3.

ing them, he should be a Person despised and rejected of Men ; because he comes not with that Earthly Pomp and State, which makes with the Men of this World, but makes a mean Appearance, and lives in Poverty and Sorrow : *And we hid as it were our Faces from him ; he was despised, and we esteemed him not ; we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted ; smitten and punished for Faults in himself.*

But surely this Man of Sorrows, and acquainted with Grief, hath born our Grievs, and carried our Sorrows : He chose not his state of Humiliation for himself, neither was he to be cut off for himself, as *Daniel* Dan. 9. 26 prophesied of him ; but to bear and remove away other Mens Grievs in Great Charity, That was the End of his coming into the World ; and this he was to do in more senses and Kinds, than One : For he hath born our Grievs, and carried our Sorrows, two ways ; to wit, by his Miraculous easing of diseased Sufferers, when they complained and cryed to him, and by suffering in his own Person for the Redemption of Mankind ; that is, by healing Mens Sickneses, and dying for our Sins : For he was wounded for our Transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities ; The Chastisement of our Peace was upon him, and with his Stripes we are healed. He condescended to a Life of Meanness and Sorrow in our Nature, that

in conversing with Men he might take occasion to ease them of their Bodily Sorrows, and to work Miraculous Cures amongst them; and moreover, he suffered as a Sacrifice for our Sins, that by his Stripes we might be healed.

The Prophet and Evangelist reconciled.

And thus that part of the Prophecy, *Surely he hath born our Grievs, and carried our Sorrows*, hath respect to his Miracles foretold in the beginning of the Prophecy, as well as to his Sufferings in the rest of the Chapter: Wherefore the Evangelist in citing this Prediction concerning the Benefits of our Saviour to Mankind, *Surely he hath born our Grievs, and carried our Sorrows*, might well be supposed to quote the Prophet as foretelling his Curing the Diseases of our Bodies, as well as his saving our Souls by offering up himself a Sacrifice for us: For the Words will naturally bear both Senses; and they may justly be interpreted to comprehend both, because both are contained in the Context of the Prophecy. So that the very same Words of the Prophet concerning our Lord, were a Prediction both of his Miracles of Healing, and also of his Sufferings for Mankind's Salvation.

A Double Sense in some Old-Testament-Prophecies, not a Stranger to the Fathers.

3. Mr. Whiston's last Objection is from Antiquity: Whether Double-Senses are to be allowed in Prophecy, he appeals to the Ancients. But alas! they are not for him

and indeed Scripture and Fathers he serves just alike. He says, *This Double Sense of Old-Testament Prophecies, or making the one Person or Thing a Type of the other, is, I think, a Stranger also to the most ancient Fathers of the Church, and came in to salve the Prejudices or Mistakes of later Times.* And to shew that the Fathers did not allow of any Double Sense, he quotes in the Margin a Passage out of *Irenæus*.

p. 26.

Now for this Author to pretend to tell us the Mind of the Fathers in a certain Point, and yet to quote but one Place only of one Father, whereby to give us the Sense of the Fathers in that Point, seems very odd, and looks as if either little or nothing was to be found in the Fathers, concerning the Matter controverted between us; or that the material Passages in the Fathers which are to the Point, do make against him; or he has referr'd the Reader to the Fathers at random, right or wrong, without having read their Writings at all, or knowing what they say in the Case.

But, what is still more to be wond'ring at, even that very particular Place which he hath cited from *Irenæus*, is not in the least to his purpose: The Title and Scope, and Design of that Discourse of the Father, had no relation at all to Double Senses in Prophecy.

Mr. Whiston's Insincerity in his Quotation from *Irenæus*.

The Argument of that Chapter * is quite another thing : The Chapter is a Discourse against such Scoffers, who asked, What New Thing *Christ* brought with him when he came ? And to them the Father Answers ; “ That *Christ* by his Coming, “ brought with him to Mankind Liberty, “ Life and Salvation, and all manner of “ Good Things. He brought also the “ Completion of the *Mosaical* Law, and of “ sundry Predictions of the Prophets, “ which was New : In particular, at, and “ soon after the Passion and Death of the “ Lord *Christ*, several Wonderful Things “ came to pass, which were never heard “ of at the Decease of any of the Old “ Fathers, or Prophets, or Kings, before “ him. Never Man suffered, at whose “ Suffering the Sun did set in the middle “ of the Day, but only *Christ* : Never at “ the Death of any one before, was the “ Vail of the Temple rent in twain : Ne- “ ver did the Earth quake, nor were the “ Rocks rent, and the Graves opened. “ Never was the Death of a Man thus Miraculously accompanied and attended. “ Nor did any Father, Prophet, or King “ rise from the Dead the Third Day after “ his Death, and afterwards ascend into

* Adversos eos qui dicunt, Quid novi veniens attulit *Christus* ?

“ Heaven, and in Ascending had the Heavens
 “ opened to him to receive him ; and never
 “ was there any one of the *Jewish* Nation,
 “ but *Christ*, in whom the *Gentiles* believed
 “ and trusted. ” These things were all
 perfectly New in *Christ Jesus* : The Pro-
 phesies of his Death, and Resurrection, and
 Ascension, and of the Gathering of the
 People to him, were never fulfilled in any
 other Person before him.

Hence it is evident, That the Father in
 this Place says not one Word against Double
 Completions of one and the same Prophe-
 cy, in Events of different Kinds ; but what
 he utterly denies, is a Duplicity or Repeti-
 tion of certain Events of the very same
 kind, which indeed were never repeated,
 but were only once.

As for Instance ; No-body's Suffering and
 Death was attended with such astonishing
 Wonders, as *Christ's* were : No-body ever
 rose from the Dead the Third Day, to Die
 no more : No-body ascended into Heaven
 after a Resurrection from the Dead, and the
 like, but our Lord *Christ*. So then the Fa-
 ther's Point was to prove (not that there
 are no Double Senses in Prophecy ; that
 was not his Subject at all, but) that there
 were several New Occurrences at the Com-
 ing of *Christ*, which were never known in
 the World before : And for Proof of his
 Point, he instances in Prophecies of the *Mes-*
sias

fiat of the Single sort, which were meant only of Him, and were fulfilled in no other Person ; and he produces Accomplishments and Events in Him, which were altogether New. Therefore I must conclude, that this Passage out of *Irenæus*, Mr. *Whiston* hath quoted either without Judgment, or without Sincerity : And I am apt to think without the latter, because I cannot easily persuade my self, that any one who has common Understanding, would have quoted this Passage for an Authority against Double Senses in Prophecy, had he not presumed his Reader would trust the Quotation without consulting the Father.

And truly it is a Sign of a bad Cause, and of no good Man engaged in it, when a Writer is so unfair, as to wrest a Father at this rate, and to catch at any thing which carries the least appearance of an Argument for him; even though he cannot but know that his Quotation, if it comes to be Examined, must be found to have nothing in it.

Typical
and Double-Sens'd
Passages in
Justin
Martyr.

This Double Sense of Old-Testament Prophecies, or making the one Person or Thing a Type of the other, is, I think, a Stranger also to the most ancient Fathers of the Church: And yet Justin Martyr, a very ancient Father of the Church, tells us expressly in his Dialogue with Trypho, "That the Holy Ghost hath sometimes caused a thing to

" b
" n
And
tion
fin
a M
Chri
mak
A
strin
" cri
" Fig
" wa
" ser
" pro
" wh
" str
" Na
" wh
" by
" ext

" Ed
προς τ
αυτων
T
ματι τ
ο τ
ης
παιδα
μοπω
τετε
πρα
Αμαλ
η η τ
εν α

" be effectually done, on purpose that it
 " might be a Figure of a Future Thing.
 And there are several Remarkable Institu-
 tions and Events of Old Time, which Ju-
 stin in the Dialogue interprets to have had
 a Mystical Meaning, with reference to the
 Christian State, and several Persons also he
 makes Types of the same kind.

As for Example ; It is that Father's Do-
 ctrine, " That the Mystery of the Sa-
 crifice of the Passover was a Type and
 " Figure of *Christ*; and accordingly that it
 " was roasted at the Fire, in a Figure re-
 sembling the Cross ; That when *Israel*
 " prevailed against *Amalek* in *Moses's* Days,
 " while his Hands were kept up, and
 " stretch'd out, *Israel* so prevailed by the
 " Name of *Jesus*, which was his Name
 " who was General of their Army, and
 " by the Sign of the Cross, which *Moses's*
 " extending both his Hands represented.
 " That

Ἐδ' ὅτε γὰρ τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα καὶ ἐναργῶς περιηράται π, ὁ
 ἄνθρωπος τῶ μέλλοντος γίνεσθαι ἦν, ἐποίησεν. — Τὸ μυστήριον τῆς
 περὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πάρα δύσιν ἐντεταλῆς ὁ Θεός, τύπος ἦν τῆς Χει-
 ρὸς. Τὸ ὁπλίσμῳ περιέβατον, σχηματίζοντες ὁμοίως τῷ σχή-
 ματι τῆς σταυροῦ, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. — Ὅτε ὁ λαὸς ἐπολέμηεν τῷ Ἀμαλὴκ,
 καὶ ὁ τῆς Ναυῆ υἱὸς ὁ ἐπονομασθεὶς τῷ Ἰησοῦ ὀνόματι τῆς μάχης
 ἦν, αὐτὸς Μωσῆς ἡνέχετο τῷ Θεῷ, τὰς χεῖρας ἐκτείνων ἐκ-
 τεταύτας. Ὡς καὶ καὶ Ααρὼν περιέβαλλον αὐτὸς πανήμας, ἵνα μὴ
 ἀποποδύντες αὐτὸν χαλαρῶσιν. εἰ γὰρ ἐνεδίδωκεν ἡ τῆς σχηματῶ-
 τέτος τῶ τὸν σταυρὸν μιμητὸς, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν ταῖς Μωσαιοῖς
 γραφαῖς, ὁ λαὸς ἠπάτο· εἰ γὰρ ἐν τῇ τάξει ἔμεινε ταύτη,
 Ἀμαλὴκ ἐνίκητο τοσούτων καὶ ἰσχυρῶν, διὰ τῆς σταυροῦ ἰσχύος. καὶ γὰρ
 ὁ πῦρ ἡνέχετο Μωσῆς, διὰ τῶν κρείων ὁ λαὸς ἐγίνετο, ἀλλ'
 ὁ πῦρ ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς μάχης τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ Ἰησοῦ ὄντος, αὐτὸς τὸ σπ-
 μεῖον

" That the Line of Scarlet-Thread which
 " Joshua's Spies bid Rahab the Harlot to
 " bind in the Window, for saving her self
 " and her Family, when Jericho was taken,
 " signified the Salvation of all Penitent
 " Sinners of all Nations, by the Blood of
 " Christ: That in Jacob's Marriage of Leah
 " and Rachel, one after another, who had
 " served for both Seven Years apiece, there
 " was Mystery respecting Christ; That
 " Leah was the Synagogue of the Jews,
 " and Rachel the Church of Christ; and
 " Christ still serves for the sake of both.
 " That the Offering of Fine Flower requi-
 " red for cleansing of Lepers, was a Fi-
 " gure of the Bread of the Eucharist, and
 " the like." For there are several other
 Passages of History in the Old Testament,
 which the Father in Conference with the
 Jew, applies to Jesus Christ; and such Ty-
 pical Passages he calls *πομπήματα* κατ'
αὐτὸ ἀπάντων.

μείον τὸ σαυρὸν ἐπίει. — Τὸ σύμβολον τὸ κοκκίνον ἀν-
 τὶς, ἃ ἐδωκεν ἐν Ιερουζαλὴμ ὁ ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ τῆς Ναυῆς πεμπόμενος ἐν
 τῇ πόλει Ρααβ τῇ πόρνη, εἰπόντες προσδεῖσθαι αὐτὸ τὴν θυγατέρα
 αὐτῆς αὐτὴς ἐχάλασεν, ὅπως λάβουσι τοὺς πολέμους, οἱμοῖον
 σύμβολον τὸ αἵματος τῆς Χρυσῆς ἐδέχετο, διὰ τὸ πάλαι πόρνη
 αἰσιν ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν ὄντων, ἀφῆκεν αἱματῶν λαβόν-
 τες, καὶ μετὰ ἀμαρτανόντες. — Τῆς ἐκ τῆς Χρυσῆς, μετὰ
 οὗς ἀπαρτίειτο ἀφῆκεν οὗτοι καὶ οἱ γάμοι τῆς Ἰακώβ. διὰ
 ἀδελφὰς καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἔδεμα τὸν γάμον τῆς Ἰακώβ. καὶ δὲ
 ἡ τῆς Λαβαν ὡς τῆς θυγατρὸς καὶ ἀδελφῆς ὅτι τῇ νεότητι
 πάλιν ἐδέχετο ἐπὶ αἵματι Λαβαν καὶ ἡ συνάραγμα τῆς
 ἡ ἐκκλησία. — Ἡ δὲ συμπόσια ὡς ὅτι ἡ
 καθεύδουσα ὑπὸ τῆς λέπρας ὡς ὅτι ὡς ὅτι
 καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τὸ εὐχαριστία.

Irenæus, whom Mr. *Whiston* quotes against Double-Senses in Prophecy, observes that there were divers Old-Testament Passages in Ancient Times which were Typical, and had all Mystery in them, with respect to the Times of the *Messias*.

Irenæus,
Epiphanius, and
St. Chrysostom, not
Strangers
to Types
and Fi-
gures.

As for Example; According to that Father, *The Elder People*, Gen. 25. 23. were in Type and Figure the *Jews*; the *Younger*, or *Latter People*, were *Christians*; *Esau's* despising his Birth-Right, and selling it to his Younger Brother *Jacob*, was the *Jews* rejecting CHRIST, the First-born of every Creature, whom a Younger People received. *Jacob's* gaining the Blessing designed by his Father for his Elder Son *Esau*, was *Christians* getting away the Divine Favour and Blessing from the *Jews*, the Elder Church. *Jacob's* Multitude of Sheep, and Cattle

Deinde autem primogenita accipiens, quando vituperavit ea frater ejus, quemadmodum & junior populus eum primogenitum Christum accepit, cum eum repulit populus Abate provectior, dicens, Non habemus Regem nisi Cæsarem. In Christo autem Univerſa Benedictio, & propter hoc Benedictiones prioris populi a patre Subripuit posterior populus, quemadmodum *Jacob* abstulit benedictionem hujus *Esau*. ——— Variæ oves siebant *Jacob* merces, & Christi merces ex variis, & differentibus Gentibus in unam cohortem fidei convenientes fiunt homines, quemadmodum patet promissit ei, Postula, dicens, à me, & dabo tibi Gentes hereditatem tuam, & possessionem tuam terminos terræ. ——— Omnia autem ille faciebat propter illam juniorem bonos oculos habentem *Rachel*, quæ præfigurabat Ecclesiam, propter quam sustinuit Christus. *Irenæus* adv. Hæres. Lib. 4. Cap. 38.

Pfal. 2.

Propter

Cattle of all sorts, wherewith his long Service was rewarded, was *Christ's* gathering out of all Nations an Universal Church. *Rachel* was the Church of *Christ*; *Jacob's* serving divers Years for Fair *Rachel*, was *Christ's* serving and suffering in his Mediatory Office, to have a *Glorious Church*, not having Spot or Wrinkle. The Stone cut out of the Mountain without Hands, was *Christ's* Conception and Birth of the Virgin *Mary* without *Joseph*, and the like.

Dan. 2. 45.

“*Epiphanius* observes, that several Dark
“and Enigmatical things in the Old Time
“of the Law and Prophets, had a Spiritu-
“al Meaning, which was explained by the
“Gospel of *Christ*: As in particular, That

Propter hoc & Daniel prævidens ejus adventum lapidem sine manibus abscissum advenisse in hunc mundum: Hoc enim est, quod sine manibus significabat, quod non operantibus humanis manibus, hoc est, virorum illorum qui solent lapides cedere, in hunc mundum ejus adventus erat; id est, non operante in eum *Joseph*, sed sola *Maria* co-operante dispositione. Lib. 3. Cap. 28.

“Ὅσα γὰρ ἦν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ καὶ ἐν περὶ ταῖς σκοτεινὰ καὶ αἰνυ-
ματώδῃ, ταῦτα ὁ κύριος ὠκονόμησε διὰ τῶ ἀγίου πνεύματος
οἷς ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν τῷ δέλω αὐτῷ Ἰωάννῃ ἀποκαλύψαι, τὰ ἐκεί-
σε σκοτεινὰ, ὧς εἰς πανδραματικὰ καὶ ἐκδηλα κερύππων. πνδ-
ματικῶς ὅτι ἡμῶν τὰ αὐτὰ ὠκονόμει, καὶ ἐκ δερμάτων μὲν πῶ
κατασκευάζει τὴ σκηνὴν, ἥν δερμάτων ἐρυθροδανομένων καὶ ὑ-
ακινθίνων καὶ τὰ ἕξῃς. ἵνα δείξῃ τὴ σκηνὴν ἐκεῖσε σκηνὴν μὲν
ἕξ, ἀποδεχομένην ὅτι τὴ τελεωτέτην σκηνὴν τῷ Χριστῷ. Λέγμα
γὰρ ἀπὸ σώματος γίγνεσθαι νεκρὸν ὅν ὡς σκιά σώματος ζώντος,
ἵνα δείξῃ σώματα ἔξ τῆ σκηνῇ τῷ Θεῷ. ἐπεὶ δὲ γὰρ ἐν σώματι
ἀγίοις κατασκευαστοὶ ὁ Θεός, πληρεμεῖς τῷ ῥήτι ὅτι κατασκευασ-
ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπειρατισθῶ. *Epiphanius contra Hæreses*
Fol. Baf. 1544. pag. 198.

“whereas

“whereas the Skin of a dead Body is some
 “kind of Shadow of a Body alive, it plea-
 “sed God to order that the Tabernacle in
 “the Wilderness should be made of *Rams* Exod. 25.
 “*skins died red, and Badgers skins* ; amongst 5.
 “other Materials, mystically to shew, that
 “the Bodies of God’s People are God’s
 “Tabernacle, in the which he declares, *He*
 “*will dwell, and walk amongst them.*

“St. Chrysostom says, That the Prophets
 “did not only speak, but they wrote what
 “they spake ; and did not only write what
 “they spake, but the Particulars contained
 “in the Words they wrote, they typified
 “by Things.

“And the same Father upon the first E-
 “pistle to the *Corinthians*, asserting the Re-
 “surrection of *Christ*, and his Birth of a
 “Vir-

‘Οὐκ ἔλεγον οἱ προφητῆς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔγραψαν ἅπερ ἔλεγον·
 ἔκ ἔγραψαν ὃ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ πραγμάτων ἐτύπεν. Chry-
 sost. in Epist. ad Roman.

Λέγω, ἀνέστη ὁ Χριστός, ὃ πρὸ παρθένης ἐγενήθη. Παράγω
 μαρτυρίας καὶ τύπας, καὶ ἀποδείξεις, τῆς Ἰωάννης ἡ ἐν τῷ κήτει δια-
 τρήσιν, καὶ ἡ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀπαλλαγὴν, τῆς σφραγίδος τοῦ τοκετός
 τῆς Σάρρα, τῆς Ρεβέκκας, καὶ τῆς λοιπῶν, ἡ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τῆς
 δένδρων Βλασὴν γαβνημωδὴν, ἡ σπερμάτων κατακληθέντων,
 ἡ ὑέτων κατενεχθέντων, ἡ αὐλακῶ ἀνατυμωδίσσης. τὰ γὰρ
 μέλλοντα διεπλάττετο καὶ διεγράφετο, ὡς ἐν σκιαῇ τοῖς προτέροις,
 ἵνα πνευθῇ ταῦτα παραχρυσόμυα. Chrysostomi in 1 Epist. ad
 Corinth. Cap. 2. Hom. 7.

Εἶδες δύο διαθηκῶν ἓνα νομοθέτην, οὐκ ἔν λοιπὸν ἐπειδὴ
 τῆς ἀγώνων ἀπικλήρωσιν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς καὶ νῦν δέξω σοι τὸτο,
 ἵνα εἰδῇς ἡ συμφωνία τῆς διαθηκῶν. εἰ δὲς ἡ προφητεία διὰ
 τῆς

“ Virgin, says, That for Proof thereof Testimonies and Types, and Demonstrations may be produced ; that is, Types and Figures together, with other Testimonies and Demonstrations of the Verity of these Articles of our Faith : And he instances in the Figures of *Jonah*, and *Sarah*, and *Rebecca*, &c.

Prophecies
by Things,
as well as
Words.

And in his 8th Homily of Repentance, he distinguishes between Prophecies by, or in Words, and Prophecies by Things : That Place in *Isaiah*, chap. 53. v. 7. He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep

ἡ ρήματα· ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν προφητείαν διὰ τῆς τύπου, ἐκ τῆς διὰ τὴν
το πάλιν ἀσαφὲς εἶναι, τί πούτε οὗτοι διὰ τῆς τύπου προφητείας, καὶ
πότε οὗτοι διὰ λόγου προφητείας. ἕκων ἐν ἑαυτῇ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα
σαφὲς. ἡ προφητεία ἢ διὰ τῆς τύπου, ἢ διὰ προφημάτων οὗτοι προ-
φητείας. ἢ ὅτι ἄλλαν προφητείαν ἢ διὰ τῆς ρήματος οὗτοι προ-
τείας. πού μὲν γὰρ σαφέστερος διὰ τῆς λόγων ἐστίν. πού γὰρ
ἀναστυφύστερος καὶ διὰ τῆς προφημάτων ὁφείας ἐπληροῦσθαι.
ἐπειδὴ γὰρ προφημα ἐμπεπλημένον ἐκείνου μέγα, καὶ ὁ θεὸς σάχα ἐ-
μπεπλημένον ἀναλαμβάνειν. ἐπειδὴ ἡ γῆ ἑαυτὴς ἐμπεπλημένη καὶ ἡ
ἡμετέρα φύσις πρὸς τὴν ἀγγέλων ευγενείαν ἀνάγκη. ἐπειδὴ
ἐκείνου ἐκείνου ἐκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου ὁ λόγος τῆς μελλόντων ἐκεί-
νου ἀγαθῶν, ἵνα μὴ τὸ κενὸν καὶ ἐκείνου ἀδύνατον ὅτι
δορυβλήση τὸν τότε ὄντα καὶ ἀκούσας, ἀνίστην ἀνίστην
διὰ προφημάτων καὶ διὰ ρήματος ἐδίξον ἑαυτὴν τὸ ἀκούειν καὶ τὴν
ὁφείλει καὶ τὸ μέλλον ἐκείνου παρρησιασθῆναι, τὸτο γὰρ ἡν ὅτι
λέγουσιν, τί οὗτοι διὰ τῆς τύπου προφητείας, καὶ τί οὗτοι διὰ λόγου προ-
φητείας. ἢ μὲν διὰ προφημάτων, ἢ διὰ ρήματος. εἰ ποῦτοι
διὰ προφημάτων ὁ προφητείας καὶ διὰ ρήματος ὁ εἰς αὐτὴν. οἱ
προφῶντες οὗτοι σαφῶς ἡ καὶ, καὶ ὡς ἀμυνὲς ἑαυτοῦ τοῦ κείνου
τοῦ αὐτοῦ. τὸτο διὰ ρήματος προφητείας. ὅτι γὰρ τὸν Ἰσακ
ἠνέγκαν, ὁ Ἀβραάμ, τότε πρὸς αὐτὸν ἰδὼν ἐκκεκρυμμένον ἐν
τῇ κρυψῇ πρὸς τὴν δυσίαν ἠναγκάσθη, καὶ ἀπαρτῆν τὴν
περὶ αὐτοῦ ἡμῶν τὸ σαφές πάντες. ὅτι γὰρ ἡν ἔλεγον, βέβαι-
ον εἶδειν τὰς δύο διαθήκας ταύτας διὰ τῆς ἔργων ἀπο-
δείξεως τὸν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ρήματι, μόνον καὶ ἡν τὸν προφημα.

sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth, - was a Verbal Prophecy. Abraham's offering the Ram instead of his Son Isaac, Gen. 22. 13. was a Prophecy by a Fact. So again, Abraham had two Sons, the one by a Bond-maid, the other by a Free-woman; but he who was of the Bond-woman was born after the Flesh, but he of the Free-woman was by Promise; which things are an Allegory: That is, a Prophecy not by Words, but by a Mystical Occurrence. Abraham had two Wives; This was a Prophecy of the latter sort: For here are Two Testaments, and One Testator, or Law-giver. The Father comes over and over again with this Distinction, and therefore I thought good to quote the Passage from him at length.

Gal. 4. 22,
23, 24.

λέγετέ μοι οἱ ὑπο νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, καλῶς εἶπε θέλοντες.
ἡ γὰρ ἡσυχία ὑπο νόμον, ἢ ἂν ἡσυχία ὑπο νόμον, τάχα
ἡσυχία ὅτι τὸ λεγόμενον. ὁ γὰρ νόμος τῷ Χριστῷ παρέπιμπε
ὑποπείχοντας. ὁ δὲ διδασκαλὸν ἀπμαζών ἀγνοεῖ καὶ τὸν
παρακαλῶν. διὸ, φησὶ, λέγετέ μοι οἱ ὑπο νόμον θέλοντες
εἶναι, ὅτι νόμον ἔκ ἀκούετε ὅτι Ἀβραάμ. δύο γὰρ ἔχοντες ἑνα ἐκ
αὐτῆς παιδίσκης, καὶ ἑνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας, ἀπὸ αὐτῆς ἀλληγοῦ-
μεθα. εἰ δὲς διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων ὅτι περὶ τῆς τοῦ γυναικὸς
ῥήματος, ἀλλὰ πρᾶγμα, καὶ δέλην, καὶ ἐλευθέραν. εἰδεξά-
μεθα διὰ τῶν ῥημάτων, ὅτι δύο διαδοχῶν εἰς ὅτι νομοθέτης. μάνθα-
να καὶ διὰ τῶν τύπων ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ Ἀβραάμ δύο γυναικὸς ἔχον-
τες. ὁ δὲ εἰς δύο διαδοχῶν, καὶ εἰς νομοθέτης ὡς περὶ ἑαυ-
τὸν καὶ πρὸς ἄλλους. τὸ καὶ ἐν ῥήματι, τὸ δὲ ἐν πρᾶγματι. πολ-
λὰ καὶ ὅτι ἔργων καὶ ὅτι λόγων ἡ συμφωνία, ὅτι καὶ ἐν ταῖς δι-
αδοχαῖς δύο, καὶ ταῦτα ὁ αὐτὸς Ἰσραὴλ διὰ ῥήματος ὅτι περὶ
αὐτοῦ, ὁ δὲ Ἀβραάμ δι' αὐτῶν ἐτύπωνται ἐν τῷ δύο γυναικὸς ἔ-
χοντες, ὡς περὶ γυναικὸς καὶ δύο γυναικὸς, ὅπως εἰς νομοθέτης
ὁ δύο διαδοχῶν. Chrysostomi de Penitentiâ Homil. 8.
Opusc. Tom. 1. Par. Ed. 1636.

Ter-

Other Fa-
thers not of
Mr. WHI-
STON's
Mind.

"Tertullian Notes, That if Adam was a Figure of Christ at all, then Adam's deep Sleep which fell upon him, was the Death of Christ, who was to sleep unto Death; and Eve's being taken out of Adam's Side, was the Church her proceeding from the opening of Christ's Side, where he was pierced; and so She, the True Mother of the Living, was Figured thereby.

"Lactantius in speaking of the Preservation of the Israelites by the sprinkling of a Lamb's Blood, when all the Egyptian First-born were smitten and destroyed, attributes nothing to the Blood of Beasts in it self, but ascribes all the saving Virtue of the Sacrifice to the Typical Meaning of the Paschal Institution, as it was an Image of Things to come; and the Blood of the Passover was in the Mystery, the Blood of Christ.

Si Adam de Christo figuram dabat Somnus Ade mortis erat Christi dormituri in mortem, ut de injuriâ perinde lateris ejus vera mater viventium figuraretur Ecclesia Tertull. Lib. de anima, cap. 25. de Somn.

Cum Ægyptiorum primogeniti una nocte interiissent Hebræi soli signo sanguinis tuti fuerunt, non quia crucis pecudis tantam in se vim gerebat, ut hominibus salutis esset, sed imago fuerat rerum futurarum. Agnus enim candidus sine macula fuit Christus, id est, innocens, justus & sanctus, qui ab eisdem Judæis immolatus salutis est omnibus qui signum sanguinis, i. e. crucis qua sanguinem fudit in sua fronte conscripserint. Lactantius de vera sapientia, Lib. quartus, Cap. 26. De agni Legis figurâ.

Super
unt in a
d Christ
Sion, &
im non
on fuit
estamen
rael, &
itur qu
ui deligi
nfans &
Christum
e morti
olentem
ia, qua
n Rachel
1. 1.

St. Jerome in his Exposition of *Hosea* 11:1 takes occasion to mention several Types in Persons of Old Time, whose Mystical Cases had their intended Completions in Christ and the Gospel-State; and he takes notice that one whole Nation was a Figure of Christ, which is the particular Subject-Matter of the Verse. For Instance: 'Sara was Sion, and Hagar was Sinai: Isaac, who carried the Wood of the Burnt-Offering, that was to Sacrifice himself, was Christ bearing his Cross. Tender-Ey'd Leah, Laban's Elder Daughter, one of Jacob's Wives, was the Synagogue of the Jews, and signified their Blindness: Fair Rachel, the Younger Daughter, his other Wife, was the Christian Church, and signified her Beauty. Israel's Departure out of Egypt, where they first began

Supereſt ut illud dicamus, quod ea quæ τῶν πατρῶν præce-
dunt in aliis, juxta veritatem & ad impletionem referuntur
ad Christum: Quod Apostolum in duobus montibus Sina
& Sion, & in Sara & Agar fecisse cognovimus; Neque ea-
rum non est Sina mons, & non est Sion, non fuit Sara &
non fuit Agar, quia hæc Apostolus Paulus ad duo retulit
Testamenta; Sic igitur hoc quod Scriptum est, Parvulus
Israel, & dilexi eum, & ex Ægypto vocavi filium meum, dia-
bitur quidem de populo Israel, qui vocatur ex Ægypto,
qui deligitur, qui eo tempore post errorem Idololatriæ quasi
infans & parvulus est vocatus, sed perfecte refertur ad
Christum: Nam & Isaac in typo Christi fuit, quod futu-
re mortis ligna sibi ipsi portaverit; & Jacob, quia Liam
volentem oculos, Rachel pulchram habuit uxorem: In
Sara, quæ major erat cæcitatem intelligimus Synagogæ,
in Rachel pulchritudinem Ecclesiæ. Hieronimi in Hosea
1. 1.

‘to be a People, was Christ’s being recalled
 ‘from thence in his Infancy.’ And else-
 where St. Jerome puts together divers Hi-
 storical Passages in the Old Testament,
 wherein the bare History was not all, as
 he tells us, but they had a Second and Spi-
 ritual Sense besides, in which they were to
 be taken: For, says he, *Judea and Jerusalem,*
Babylon and Philistim, Moab and Damascus,
&c. are so to be understood.

*The Fathers
 full of
 Types.*

P. 27

If Mr. Whiston, instead of saying, That
the making of one Person or Thing a Type of
another, is a Stranger to the Fathers, had
 told us, That the Fathers abound with
 Types, then indeed he had said the real Truth
 and he himself owns as much. ‘Tis true,
 says he, *the Fathers, and in the head of them*
St. Barnabas, do frequently make use of Types
and Allusions, which they drew from the Ritual
Laws of Moses, and from many Passages of
History in the Old-Testament; as St. Paul, in
compliance, perhaps, with the Jewish Doctrine
of those Times, and his own strict Education
therein, had to better Purpose, and on better
Foundations, done before them: And several
remarkable Events and Histories of Old Time

Post Historiæ veritatem Spiritualitè accipienda sunt
 omnia, & sic *Judea & Jerusalem, Babylon & Philistim, Mo-*
ab & Damascus, & ad extremum Tyrus, & visio quadrup-
lum intelligenda sunt; Proem. in Esaiam ad Eusebium.

seem

seem to have been particularly recorded for the sake of some future Truths and Discoveries, which were to be drawn from them. So that it is not much to be wondered at, if the Zeal and Piety of the Primitive Writers gave themselves a large scope in such mystical, and not unuseful Applications: Which is unsaying what he had said before, That the Doctrine of Types is a Stranger to the Fathers. But then this is quite another thing from that old Application of Prophecies, of which we are now discoursing; that is, from any Prophecies taken in a Double Sense: For he would have us distinguish Types and Allusions from direct Prophecies; because, says he, The use of the Ancient Prophecies to be alledged from the Old Scriptures for the Confirmation of Christianity, is quite of another Nature, and of more nice and exact Consideration, and was so looked upon by the Primitive Fathers.

And who does not look upon Types and Prophecies to be something distinct in their nature? The Fathers, never that I remember, take any notice of these Literal and Typal Senses, as of two distinct Interpretations fully intended in the ancient Prophecies. Any one may discern that he speaks something dubiously under this Head, as if he could not be very certain that he is in the right: His Double Sense of Old-Testament Prophecies, or making the one Person or Thing a Type of the other, is, I think, a Stranger to the

p. 29.

most ancient Fathers ; and they never, that I remember, take any notice of these *Literal and Typical Senses*. His Memory here is not good, or else (which indeed I am rather inclinable to suspect) he has consulted the Fathers but little, and has made a very *small Examination* of what they say on this Point.

*Duplicity
of Sense in
some Pro-
phesies
taught by
the Fathers,
and the
Current
Doctrine of
the Primi-
tive Times.*

I have abundantly shewn already, that the Fathers have taken notice of *Literal and Typical Senses*, as of two distinct Interpretations, in Places which they thought do relate to the *Messias* ; and I shall shew farther, that they have taken notice of two distinct Interpretations, as really intended even in some Ancient Prophecies.

St. Chrysostome would have us observe That there are Prophecies by Things as well as by Words ; and therefore he could not but take notice, that sometimes in one and the same thing there is both Letter and Mystery, History and Prophecy. Besides, the same Father takes notice, and asserts, that there are διπλαῖ προφητεῖαι, Double Prophecies.

Ἄλλως δὲ εἰσι καὶ διπλαῖ πολλαὶ προφητεῖαι πῶς αὐτῶν περὶς διατάλητοι, ὥς ὅτι πλῆθὺν ἢ ἀσφῶν ὅτιν ἔστιν
Chrysostomi in 1 Epist. ad Cor. Cap. 2. Hom. 7.

Ter

Tertullian denies that the Prophets always used an Allegorical Form of Speaking in the way of Typical Prophecy; but he takes notice, that in some Places they deliver themselves after that manner, and allows that so they do speak sometimes, though more rarely: And then *St. Jerome* most expressly interprets *Hosea* 11. 1. in a Double Sense, as meant both of the Children of *Israel*, and of *Christ*: Which are most clear Testimonies for my purpose, to convince *Mr. Whiston* of his Error, unless perhaps some of the Fathers now quoted, are not Ancient and Primitive enough for him: For he seems to say, that the Opinions of Fathers beyond the Three first Centuries, are not much to be minded.

Advice
for the
Study of
Divinity,
p. 239, 301.

I shall not swell my Book, and cloy the Reader with any more Quotations of this sort, these shall suffice.

Præstructionem eorum depellam quæ volunt omnia prophetas per imagines concionatos: Plures voces prophetarum nudæ & simplices, & ab omni Allegoriæ nubilo puræ defendi possunt. Non semper, nec in omnibus allegorica forma est Prophetici eloquii, sed interdum & in quibusdam. *Tertullian de Resurrectione de Carnis.*

Hoc quod scriptum est, *Parvulus Israel, & dilectum meum*, & ex *Egypto* vocavi filium meum DICITUR QUIDEM DE POPULO ISRAEL, qui vocatur ex *Egypto*, qui dicitur, qui eo tempore post errorem Idololatriæ, quasi infans & parvulus est vocatus. SED PERFECTE REFERTUR AD CHRISTUM.

I will only add one thing more, which seems to me a farther Argument, that the Notion of Double-Senses in Prophecy was not a Stranger to the Fathers. *Julian* and *Porphyry*, and the *Jews*, very fiercely accused *St. Matthew* of wresting *Hosea* II. I. forasmuch as he applied those Words to *Jesus*, which were meant of the Children of *Israel*: But it seems *Julian* was the Infidel who scoff'd most on this Account, and made the greatest Noise with the Objection. And yet I observe, that neither *St. Jerome*, in his Comment on *Hosea* II. I. takes any notice of the Objection, to answer it by his Exposition there; nor doth *St. Gregory Nazianzene*, in his two sharp Invectives against *Julian*, mention it at all, to vindicate the Evangelist against that Clamour of the Apostate. Now that in *Hosea* II. I. a Duplicity of Sense was intended, was, I conceive, every whit as clear to *St. Gregory Nazianzene*, as it was to *St. Jerome*, who both flourished in the same Century.

From whence we may rationally conjecture, what the Reason was, why both Fathers do decline taking notice of the Objection; the one in his Commentary, the other in his Orations; and are silent about it. And in all likelihood it was this, Both of them despised the Objection alike, as not worth their minding or regarding any more, be-

Critic. in
Matth. 2.
15.

cause

cause it had been sufficiently baffled and quieted already, by that solid Answer to it contained in St. Jerome's Exposition of *Hosea II. 1.* which was the Sense of the Fathers, and the Current Doctrine of those Times. Wherefore let any one but compare St. Jerome's Exposition of the Place with St. Gregory Nazianzene against Julian, and then let him tell me, whether he has just cause to think, that this Double Sense in some Old-Testament Prophecy, was altogether a Stranger to the Primitive Fathers.

I have now said enough, in answer to Mr. Whiston's pretended Demonstrations of an Unity of Sense in all Prophecy, which he worthily sums up in this manner. *Upon the whole, This Double-Sense and Interpretation of the Ancient Prophecies upon which so great a stress has been of late laid by Christian Writers, appears to me by what small Examination I have been able to make, so absurd in it self, so unlimited in its Extent, so pernicious to the Scripture-Proofs of our Christian Faith, so wholly a Stranger to Christ and his Apostles, and the most Primitive Fathers, that I dare by no means at all depend upon it.*

But why does Mr. Whiston build so great Confidence upon a *small Examination*? If he has not been able to make any more than a *small Examination*, as himself confesses, why then is there such an Air of Positive-

Mr. Whiston Positive in his Opinion, upon a small Examination.

p. 29.

ness in this part of his Book, as if the Conclusion he draws from his Arguments were an Absolute Demonstration, and he had made the greatest Examination possible? Why is he so forward and hasty to determine even against the Learnedest Expositors, not staying till such time as he should be able to examine things better?

His Presence to Wariness and Caution, while he ventures boldly.

p. 259.

He dares not depend upon the Modern Interpretations of some Prophecies: Alas for him! he would be thought a nice and wary Man in his Enquiries after Truth, before he yields his Assent, or that any thing can pass with him for Truth; and he would seem to be one who is very cautious and timorous before his Determinations. But why then hath he ventured, as he tells us, to correct our present Copies in *Samuel*? For that's a Venture indeed, and a very bold Stroke too. And then again, why doth he venture to say, that our Lord, when he Ascended, went no higher than the utmost height of the Air, not above 40 or 50 Miles from the Earth? For that's a bold Paradox, and a thing most absolutely false, as I shall shew presently.

Perhaps, for a Writer, he is one of the most venturesome Men that ever put Pen to Paper; and one would think he may dare to do any thing. Yet, says he, I dare by no means, depend at all upon *this Double-Sense, upon which so great a stress has been*

late laid by Christian Writers: Alas a day !
where his Courage quite fails him, and he must
be excused : He loves dearly to advance
new and strange things, and in that kind he
ventures without Fear or Wit ; but as for
a plain Point in Divinity, a Common Do-
ctrine of Christian Writers, truly, it can by
no means go down with him ; and so the
Squeamish Gentleman *strains at Gnats, and*
swallows Camels.

Mr.

*Mr. Whiston's Hypothesis, of
Frequent Ascensions of Christ,
Examined and Refuted.*

MR. Whiston hath subjoin'd *His great*
to his Accomplishment of *Vanity in*
Scripture-Prophecies, a Dis- subjoining
sertation to prove, that the Tract
our Saviour ascended into of Ascen-
Heaven on the Evening af- sions.
ter his Resurrection ; in

which he conceives he hath made it ap-
pear, that our Lord after his Resurrection
frequently ascended up into Heaven, be-
fore his Great Ascension thither at the end
of Forty Days, believed by *All Christians.*

It seems our Author performed so admi-
rably (in his own Opinion) at Mr. Boyle's
Lecture, that when he came to Print his
Discourses on that Occasion, he could not
forebear obliging the World a little farther,
even by an unexpected Tract on another
Subject in the same Book. For he was so
highly pleased with his New Notion of se-
veral Ascensions of *Christ*, that he thought
it

it great Pity the World should go without it, and not be entertained too; and so he resolv'd to tack it to his *Accomplishment of the Prophecies*.

Now it is not usual with Authors to go this way to work in their Treatises. When they propound the distinct handling of any particular Subject in a Book, it is very seldom that they clap another Subject to it, which is altogether foreign to that about which the Book is wrote. Wherefore, surely it must be some vastly important Discovery, which one is almost bound in Conscience to report to the World, that can excuse and justify this Author's going so much out of the common Road: But alas! The Subject-Matter of his Additional Piece is quite of another kind. The thing we must needs know from him, (which he had been so happy as but newly to discover) was no other than this, That *our Saviour ascended into Heaven on the Evening after his Resurrection*; and that he ascended and descended several times, now and then, before he ascended for good and all. And is this the mighty Point, which he thought it worth his while to make out in so odd an *Appendix*? Is not this at best but an unprofitable and useless Speculation, were the thing never so true which he pretends to prove? Is it not enough for *Christians* to believe that our Lord once Ascended into Heaven at the

end
with
that
veni
Or,
dera
mad
ed i
The
wha
of h
Part
verin
H
not
caus
rent
thes
and
Vulg
out
tion
Rea
mon

In
p. 49
Subje
then,
Publi
of Se
Subje

en

end of Forty Days after his Resurrection, without believing that he often Ascended in that time, and that he Ascended on the Evening of the same Day, when he rose? Or, would this New Belief be any considerable Addition to our Faith, were it made an Article of the Creed, and inserted into the System of Christian Divinity? Therefore for my part, I cannot see for what End he published this Piece at the end of his Sermons, unless it were to shew his Parts, and how much he excels in discovering New Things.

However, the World must needs have it, not for any use to which it can serve, but because it contained what is Singular, and different from Common Opinion: For new Hypotheses he likes better than settled Doctrines; and he seems to intimate, That generally *Vulgar and Modern Notions* are taken up without Ground, and destitute of all solid Foundation in the World; and he therefore dislikes Reasoning from *Vulgar Prejudices, and Common Opinions.* p. 286. p. 288.

In the *History of the Works of the Learned for August, 1709.* p. 492. we are told that Mr. Whiston's last Book contains Subjects of Discourse that are all of 'em useful. It seems then, in the Judgment of the Gentlemen who are the Publishers of the Monthly History of Books, his Essay of *Several Ascensions* is an Useful Piece, being one of the Subjects of Discourse in that Collection.

I grant

I grant indeed that neither on the other hand is there much hurt in believing, that *Christ* Ascended often, though the thing were not true; and upon that Account some will think, that I might have spared troubling my self to refute an harmless Error: But yet I have considered that some Censure of his crude and unedifying Hypothesis, might not be amiss, if it were only to rebuke that Spirit of Vanity and Conceit, with which he obtrudes it upon the World.

It may be thought I cannot reasonably pretend to be certain, that our Lord did not ascend into Heaven on the Evening after his Resurrection, or that he did not Ascend in any of the Forty Days; for he might frequently Ascend in those Forty Days, though the Gospel-History be utterly silent about it. But there is one Testimony, which alone, I think, is enough to undo all Mr. *Whiston's* Hypothesis, to wit, That Saying of our Saviour not long before his Passion, Resurrection and Ascension, in *John* 16. 28. *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the World; again I leave the World, and go to the Father.* For as he came forth from the Father, and came into the World at his Incarnation and Birth, which was only once; so in like manner he should leave the World, and go to the Father, (*i. e.*) but once. When he

was

wa
he
Mi
def
Soc
wer
retu
Fath
cept
Saul,
an
said,
Fathe
he o
Worl
gain
the V
ther i
a four
son pl
So
viour,
went t
Tet a
go unt
bles, I
and ag
* mo

* How
y Father,
ather he
and again

was come into the World from the Father, he did not before his Entrance upon his Ministry, go up to the Father again, and descend from him a second time, as the Socinians imagine : So neither when he went from the World to the Father, did he return into the World, and ascend to the Father again, as Mr. Whiston imagines ; except when he came down and appeared to Saul, to Convert, and call him to be an Apostle. Nor could it be so properly said, that he left the World in going to the Father, if after Ascending to the Father, he often returned from the Father into the World, and then went up to the Father again ; and so moved up and down, from the World to the Father, and from the Father into the World, a second, a third, and a fourth time, or as many times as Mr. Whiston pleases.

So likewise it is said concerning our Saviour, That he *was come from God, and went to God* ; and he said to the Pharisees, *Let a little while I am with you, and then I go unto him that sent me* ; and to his Disciples, *Now I go my way to him that sent me* ; & 7. 33. and again, *I go to my Father, and ye see me no more*. All which sorts of Expressions do

* How could our Saviour say to his Disciples, *I go to my Father, and ye see me no more*, if after he went to the Father he descended frequently, and they saw him again ?

plainly signify only one Solemn Ascension of our Lord *Jesus* to his Father, without those sudden Movements, and hasty Journeys, up and down, to and fro in the Forty Days, which Mr. *Whiston* groundlessly conceives. For, what if I could not disprove a double or frequent Ascension of *Christ*? I can shew however, that Mr. *Whiston* hath not proved it; though I could not be able to make out the Negative, I am sure he hath not proved the Affirmative; but his Arguments are as trifling as the Point he would prove by them, which, in short, is This

PROPOSITION.

P. 279.

Our Blessed Saviour Ascended up to Heaven the Evening of that very Day, on which he rose from the Dead.

Christ Ascended not on the Evening of the Day on which he rose.

An Ascension of Christ on that Evening, not proved from St. Luke.

This Assertion is proved by several Arguments; so says he. And his first Argument is this; That the continued Narrative of all that passed on the Day of our Lord's Resurrection, concludes with the Account of his Ascension: Therefore he both rose and ascended on the same Day, rose in the Morning, and ascended in the Evening. For relating in order the several Occurrences of that Famous Day, and observing to us that our Lord had some Discourse with the Apostles assembled, as

stood in the midst of them, he says, AND AS SOON AS HIS DISCOURSE WAS OVER, he led them forth as far as Bethany, and lift up his hands upon them, and blessed them; and it came to pass while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and was carried up into Heaven. Which I say is very false; and I utterly deny that our Lord led the Apostles as far as Bethany, and blessed them, and was parted from them into Heaven on the Evening of the Resurrection, as soon as his Discourse with them was then over: And Mr. Whiston's Comment of this sort, is, I must say, a Scandalous Perversion of the Evangelist's History; and yet, without the least Sense of his Gross Error, he scruples not to say, That St. Luke not only hints a double Ascension in the general, by giving us two distinct Accounts of his going up to Heaven, but most directly and plainly assures us, that he did ascend at the time assigned, in this particular Account of the Occurrences of that Famous Day: And again, that this is plain Truth expressly taught by St. Luke. And truly here is the $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\nu \Psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron$ that misled him into an Opinion of frequent Ascensions, and then put him upon Difficulties, and involved him in Absurdities to maintain the Hypothesis; nay, it seems he was forced to call in the help of Philosophy, for making good this Point: And he led them forth as far as Bethany, and he lift up

p. 279.

p. 281.

his hands, and blessed them ; and it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and was carried up into Heaven ; that is, not on the Evening of the Day when he rose, not at that time when he first Discoursed with them after he was risen, but at the end of Forty Days : For in that part of St. Luke's Narrative, *Ἐξήντα δὲ* And he led them out as far as Bethany, &c. which immediately follows the Account of what passed on the Day of his Resurrection, the Particle *δὲ* conjoins distant things for the Brevity of the History : And this way of shortning Narratives, by relating things that passed at very different and distant Times, as if they had been done at one and the same time, was no new Thing

Mr. Whiston in his *Ascensions of Christ* Reprinted, 157. is very positive that no Writers, Sacred or Profane, do ever shorten History in this manner. I am sure, says he, if we saw an History with the like plain Circumstances of Time in Herodotus or Livy, we should make no Scruple to assert, that it belonged to the very Time at first mentioned. And I am sure, that if we saw an History with the like plain Circumstances of Time in Herodotus or Livy, or any other Historian, we should make no Scruple to assert, that it could not belong to the very Time first mentioned, but to another Time. And why the Sacred Writers must not be supposed as careful at least, and as accurate as the Profane, I do by no means understand. Nor do I ; For the Sacred Writers must be supposed, at least, as careful and accurate as the Profane : But then both Sacred and Profane Writers, may sometimes Abbreviate their Histories, in the way of Connecting things done at different times, as if they were done at the same time, without serving to be charged with Carelessness or Inaccuracy in such their Abbreviations.

but we find such Abridgments of History elsewhere in Scripture.

Thus for Example, When *Moses* recounted to the *Israelites* their provoking Murmurs, and Rebellions against God, and minded them in particular that God had been very angry with them, for one horrid Instance of their Distrust in his Power and Goodness, in some time of their stay on the Borders of *Canaan*, after they had journeyed thither; to wit, for that they had not only deem'd the *Canaanites* Invincible, after the Spies that had been sent to view their Land brought an Evil Report of it, but also complained, and wept, and murmured against *Moses* and *Aaron*, as if they themselves were in great Danger from such Potent Neighbours, and talked of returning to *Egypt*: He adds, *Also the Lord is angry with me for your sakes, saying, Thou shalt not go in thither*, Deut. i. 37. As if God had been angry with *Moses* at that time, when he was angry with the *Israelites*, for the foolish Fright they were under from the *Anakims* of *Canaan*; whereas God's Anger with *Moses* for their sakes, was not till Eight and Thirty Years after: For the Land of *Canaan* was searched in the Second Year after the *Israelites* came out of *Egypt*; but the Offensive Passage at the Water of *Meribah*, when the Rock in *Horeb* was smitten a second time, was in the fortieth Year.

*Distant
things con-
joined in
Scripture.*

Thus again, says *Moses* in *Numb. 20. 1.* THEN came the Children of *Israel*, even the whole Congregation, to the Desert of *Zin*, in the first Month; as if he were going on with the History of the Third Year after the departure of the *Israelites* out of *Egypt*; whereas he passes to the Fortieth Year after they came from thence, and takes no notice of the Occurrences and Transactions in the Seven and Thirty Years between the two first and the last, *Numb. 20. 1.* compared with *Deut. 2. 14.*

So again, as I have observed, the Sacred Historian, *Deut. 10. 6.* relates for Brevity-sake, that the Children of *Israel* took their Journey from *Beeroth* of the Children of *Jaakan* to *Mosera*, where *Aaron* Died, and was Buried; that part of the Mountain *Hor* being called *Moseroth*; when as they journey'd to several other Places from *Bene-jaakan* and made some stay there, before they came to *Moseroth*, or Mount *Hor*, in which *Aaron* died; as we read *Numb. 33. 32, 33, 34, &c.*

*Bishop Pa-
trick on
Deut. 10.
6.*

And so likewise in the First Book of *Chronicles*, the Writer of that Book passes from the History of *Saul's* Death for his Sin, to give an Account of the Translation of the Kingdom of *Israel* to *David*; as *David* immediately after *Saul's* Death, succeeded on the Throne of *Israel*. THEN all *Israel* gathered themselves to *David*

It is r
gust De
the begi
of Hezek
pinels in
Lamb, an
any way

Hebron, &c. and they anointed David King over Israel, chap. 11. ver. 1, 2, 3. And yet from Saul's Death to David's Reign over all Israel, it was no less than Seven Tears, and Six Months, 2 Sam. 5. 5. which Interval is entirely left out in the First Book of the *Chronicles*.

And then this putting of things together very distant from each other, as if the Facts so joined belonged to one and the same time, we find not only in History, but in Prophecy too : For in the beginning of the Eleventh Chapter of *Isaiah*, the Prophecy of *Christ's* Coming is conjoined with a Prediction of such a Glorious State of his Church, as should be very remote from the time of his Appearing in the World, and from the first Ages of the Church, and was not to be fulfilled till the latter Ages of it, as Mr. *Whiston* grants, *Collect. of Scripture-Prophecies*, p. 374. And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots, &c. The Wolf also shall dwell with the Lamb, and the
Leo-

It is marvellous that Mr. *White* can think, that the August Description of an Illustrious and Glorious Person in the beginning of the Prophecy, was meant for a Character of *Hezekiah* ; or that the Great Promise of Peace and Happiness in the World, *The Wolf also shall dwell with the Lamb, and the Leopard shall lie down with the Kid*, &c. was any way verified in his Reign. I have well considered

Leopard shall lie down with the Kid, &c.
 And are the Sacred Writers all the while to be censured as *Careless* and *Inaccurate*, because of these Connections of distant things? No, by no Means.

I need not mention any more Instances of this sort: Even St. *Luke* joins his History of the Occurrences on the Day of our Lord's Resurrection, in such manner, for Brevity sake, as if he both rose and ascended on the same Day; whereas he ascended not till Forty Days after. For that St. *Luke*, at the end of his Gospel, speaks of the self-same Ascension he begins with in his other Treatise, though with some difference in the Relation, in respect of some Circumstances, and that both Accounts are Histories of *one and the same Event*, are abundantly proved by the following Arguments; viz.

1. The same Visibility and Notoriety of the Fact it self, is equally related in Both Histories.
2. The Great Wonder wherewith the Apostles beheld it, we are not told of till the Second Account of the Fact.

Mr. *White's* Reasons for his Hypothesis, both in his Argument of that Chapter, and also in his Exposition of it, and find them no way satisfactory: And I do affirm, (and I think upon clear Evidence) that never was there a State of things under the Sun, since the time when this Prophecy was given, which comes up to it, and that it remains yet to be fulfilled.

The

3. The Blessing our Lord blessed them withall at his parting from them, we have in the former Account of the Fact, and not in the latter.
4. There is the very same immediate Consequent of the Fact in Both Histories ; And
5. The Evangelist mentions but one Single Day, in which our Lord Ascended.

I. St. *Luke* in the Conclusion of his former Treatise, tells us, That our Lord in ascending, *ἔδειξεν ὅτι αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ἄνωγαν*, was parted from them, and carried up into Heaven ; which evidently shews that Ascension to be the very same with the Ascension in the *Acts*, where the same thing is related in other Words, viz. That he was taken up, and a Cloud received him out of their sight. He was parted from them ; that is, his Body still was as visible in its moving up from them, as it was while he stood in the midst of them. At *Bethany* he did not vanish, but ascend, and so was seen in the very Act of his going up from them : And Mr. *Whiston* distinguishes between his imagin'd sudden Ascent of our Lord on the Morning of his Resurrection, and his supposed Ascension on the Even of the same Day ; in that the former, he says, *the Apostles saw not*, and it was in their *Absence* ; but the latter was visible, as well as what he calls the *Final Ascension*.

The Self-same Ascension in Luke 24. 51. and Acts 1. 9. demonstrated.

p. 300. Ascens. Re-print. p. 152, 154.

Now, if indeed the Evangelist at the end of his Gospel, had related the Ascension in this manner, That he went a little space from the Apostles, and then ascended in their View; or, That he ascended up a little way, and then disappear'd before he reach'd the Cloud, or the like; with some Colour of Reason he might have been thought to speak of two different Visible Ascensions, that were differently seen by them at two different times. But whereas we read in one of the Histories, that our Lord was parted from them, and carried up into Heaven, and in the other, that he was taken up from them, while they beheld; which Phrases signify exactly the same thing: We must be ready to conclude, that St. Luke speaks of one and the self-same Visible Ascension of our Lord, in which he went up from the midst of the Apostles, and was viewed by them, till the Cloud received him out of their sight.

II. It is evident, that the Ascension in Luke 24. 51. is the very same with Acts 1. 9. because in the latter Account the Apostles are represented as beholding it with Great Wonder and Amazement; *they looked stedfastly toward Heaven, as he went up, and the two Angels said unto them, Why stand ye gazing up into Heaven?* This shews That they had not beheld any such thing before, and consequently that there was no visible

Acts 1. 10.
II.

visib
the
rose
been
time
Sacre
the
witho
der i
Cause
the fir
of the
afterw
Wond
cend
me, a
Body
might
their
list to
the Fa
is mer
not in
III.
with o
parting
count
the Af
deed, a
and co
with th
sing, w

visible Ascension of our Lord into Heaven, the Evening of that very Day on which he rose from the Dead : For suppose there had been any such Visible Ascension at that time, it might seem something odd in the Sacred Historian, to give us an Account of the supposed former Visible Ascension, without any Expressions betokening Wonder in the Apostles, when there was most Cause for their Wondering, because it was the first Ascension they saw ; and to tell us of their Astonishment at another Ascension afterwards, when there was less Cause for Wondering, because they had seen him ascend before. It is therefore very clear to me, and, I think, it should be so to every Body else, unless Mr. *Whiston*, That their mighty Wondering at the Ascension of their Master, was reserved by the Evangelist to be express'd in the latter Account of the Fact, as their Great Joy at seeing it, Luke 24. is mentioned in the former Account, and 52. not in the latter.

III. I observe, that the Blessing where-with our Saviour blessed his Disciples at his parting from them, we have in the first Account of his Ascension ; which shews that the Ascension at *Bethany* was a Parting indeed, and a taking his Leave of them ; and consequently, that it is the very same with the Ascension in the *Acts* : For Blessing, we know, is usually a Valedictory Act.

p. 154.

V. 50.

Act. I would therefore ask Mr. *Whiston*, whether our Saviour's lifting up his Hands, and Blessing his Disciples in so solemn a manner at *Bethany*, doth not imply that he then left them; and whether so solemn a Benediction and Valediction can be well supposed to consist with his Descending to them presently again, or with several Ascents and Descents afterwards? It is then very plain that *Luke 24. 51.* and *Acts 1. 9.* are Accounts of one and the self-same Ascension; the Blessing mentioned in the former Account being omitted in the latter, as there are other Circumstances in the latter, which are omitted in the former.

IV. In both Histories we find the same immediate Consequent of our Lord's Ascension: For we are told in both, that from the Place of his Ascension, the Apostles forthwith repaired to the Temple at *Jerusalem*, for Prayer and Supplication there. For, as in the former History we read that the Apostles, after our Lord was parted from them into Heaven, worshipped him, and returned to *Jerusalem* with great Joy, *Luke 24. 51, 52.* So likewise in the latter History, that after the Apostles had seen him go into Heaven, they returned to *Jerusalem* from the Mount called *Olivet*, *Acts 1. 2.* And again, as in one of the Histories it is related that they were continually in the Temple praising and blessing God, *Luke*

53. so the other tells us, That the Apostles, when they were come into the City of Jerusalem, went up into an upper Room in the Temple εἰς τὸ ὑπερώϊον, where they all continued with one accord in Prayer and Supplication, Acts i. 12, 13, 14. Certainly then St. Luke must be supposed to speak of one and the same Ascension in his Gospel, and in the Acts, since in both Relations, till the Ascension of our Lord is immediately followed with one and the same Passage; which is this, That the Apostles, after they had seen our Lord going into Heaven with Wonder, went straight to the Temple, and with all Zeal and Devotion Prayed together there. From that amazing sight, thither they hastned with great Joy to Glorify God for their Ascended Master, and to Bless and Praise the Divine Majesty for the Wonderful Thing they had seen.

V. The Evangelist in the beginning of his latter History, repeating that Narrative of our Lord's Ascension with some Addition, in which he had been brief before, refers to the very same Day (not Days) in which he was taken up, whereof he had spoken before; For therefore he begins his History of the Acts of the Apostles, with a repetition of the same Fact with which he concludes his Gospel; to wit, with the Ascension of Christ. Mr. Whiston will have that the Day mentioned, Acts i. 2. in which

Acts i. 2.

Ascensions
Reprint.
p. 160.

which *Jesus was taken up*, whereto *St. Luke's Gospel extended*, was the Day of his supposed first Ascension, viz. the Day of his Resurrection. But how can *Mr. Whiston* think that *St. Luke* is so to be understood? For if our Saviour ascended on several Days after his Resurrection, how can we suppose that the Evangelist, *Acts* 1. 2. should speak only of one of those Days, viz. the first of them, without taking notice of any of the rest? Surely, if our Saviour had ascended frequently after his Resurrection, the Evangelist would not have said, *Untill THE DAY*, ἀχρι ἡς ἡμέρας, but untill the Days or first of the Days, in which he was taken up.

Lay these Observations together, and they will amount to a clear and perfect Demonstration, That *St. Luke* at the end of his former, and at the beginning of his latter Treatise, speaks of one and the same Ascension: Nay, I will say, the Five Arguments considered together, are as good a Demonstration of this thing, as *Mr. Whiston* can produce for any of his Propositions in the *Mathematicks*. And yet he says, *What can be plainer than this Narration*? That is, than this Narration of an Ascension of our Saviour on the Even of his Resurrection? But I do say, What can be plainer, than that *Mr. Whiston* has com-

p. 157.

mitte

mitted a foul Blunder, in having made St. Luke's Narrative of our Lord's Ascension, quite another thing than the *Evangelist* intended?

And yet in his *Ascensions* reprinted, p. 54, 155. he dares to quote St. Mark also for his Opinion, whose History at the end of his Gospel, he durst not meddle with before : *After the Lord had spoken to them, he was received up into Heaven, and sat on the Right Hand of God, Mark 16. 19.* St. Mark here concludes his History of the Appearances of *Christ* to his Disciples time after time, in the Forty Days after his Resurrection, with an Account of but one Solemn Ascension of *Christ*, and no more : So then, *after the Lord had spoken to them, he was received up into Heaven, &c.* that is, when he had given them the Precepts and Promises particularly mentioned by the *Evangelist* in that Chapter, and also had spoken to them in the Forty Days, of all those things pertaining to the Kingdom of God, in which he thought fit to instruct them in that time ; then *he was received up into Heaven, and sat on the Right Hand of God.* No, says Mr. *Whiston* ; They who wrest these Words to the *Final Ascension*, must do so, not because the Text of it self points that way, but because their Prejudices do not permit them to think of any other.

An Ascension of Christ on the Evening of the Day in which he rose, not proved from St. Mark.

He

He sees every thing very clearly, and therefore all they that differ from him must be under *Prejudices*, if they pretend to see any thing. Well, but doth not *the Text* of *it self point that way*? as if St. Mark spake of Christ's Ascension at the end of Forty Days, since that Ascension of Christ was immediately followed with his sitting on the *Right Hand of God*? For did he sit down there in his supposed short Stays with God, when he frequently and suddenly ascended and descended, during the Interval of the Forty Days? And do not the Words immediately following in the next Verse, *point that way too*? *And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the Word with Signs following*: For do we read that the Eleven Apostles went forth in any of the Forty Days after his Resurrection, and preached every where, or any where? Or do we read that the Lord, when he was risen, wrought any Miracles by them for the Confirmation of the Word, till after his Ascension at the end of Forty Days, and he had sent *the Promise of the Father* upon them in the Wonderful Effusion of the Holy Ghost?

Mr. Whiston's Hypothesis not favoured by Beza.

O! But the Learned Beza, in his Notes upon this Chapter, doth as good as confess that Mr. Whiston is in the right: Marcus summo judicio, UT BREVITATI STUDE

RET

RET, declarationem Resurrectionis Domini in tres veluti partes distribuit ; Primum enim narrat, quomodo mulieribus apparuerit ; quod quidem non semel factum fuisse ex aliis Evangelistis intelligitur : Marcus verò hæc omnia in unum velut corpus conjungit ; Deinde exponit quomodo eodem die fuerit duobus illis conspectus, qui rus ibant ; In postremâ demùm parte commemorat, quomodo discipulis apparuerit, incipiens à primâ illâ apparitione, quæ facta est eo ipso die quo resurrexit, quam aliæ postea multæ consecutæ sunt ; sed eas omnes rursus in unam velut historiam contrahit, ideòque postremam hanc apparitionem vocat, quæ ab ipso die Resurrectionis ad Ascensionem usque porrigitur, ut liquet ex versiculo 19. Eandem prorsus rationem sequitur Lucas postremo capite, in quo ita connectit primam illam apparitionem cum postremâ, ut NISI QUIS HOC QUOD DIXI, CONSIDERET sit existimaturus Dominum eo ipso die quo primum apparuit discipulis, id est, quo resurrexerat, in cælum ascendisse, cum dies quadraginta intercesserint, ut ipsemet refert. Act. 1. 3. Which, says he, in plain English implies, That unless Men come with the common Prejudice of a Single Ascension at the end of Forty Days, the Series both of St. Mark and St. Luke will persuade them that our Lord ascended also on the very Evening of his Resurrection.

This

This is highly provoking: For, says *Beza*, *Nisi quis hoc quod dixi consideret*, unless one considers well what the perverse *Mr. Whiston* will not consider; viz. That both *Evangelists* in their Histories studied Brevity alike; he may chance to think as wildly as *Mr. Whiston* does; That is, from the Connection of *Christ's* first appearance with his last in *St. Luke*, which was only for Brevity, as I have before observed, A Man may happen to fall into this Mistake, That our Saviour ascended on the same Day that he rose. And now the due Consideration of what *Beza* had said, which the Learned *Expositor* recommends as a Preservative against such a Mistake, *Mr. Whiston* calls a *Prejudice*; and so all those Persons are prejudiced, that are not as wilfully Blind and Inconsiderate as himself, and even *Beza* too must fall under his rude Censure.

Christ ascended not from different Places, P. 285.

But then *St. Luke* doth still more clearly distinguish the two Ascensions; viz. the Ascension on the Day of the Resurrection, and the Final One, by the differences of the Places from whence, as well as we have seen he did by the difference of the Times when he ascended, in each Narration. And doth the *Evangelist* clearly distinguish between Two Ascensions this way too? I deny it. This is altogether as false, as that our Lord ascended at different Times: For it is very clear that *St. Luke* in his Narrations, distinguishes

distinguishes Ascensions no more in respect of
 Place than of Time, and each Narration
 speaks only of one time *when*, and of but
 one place *from whence* he ascended. No, says
 our Author; *We have already proved* (after
 his way of proving) *that the Ascension in*
the Gospel was on the Even of the Resurre-
ction: We shall now prove that they were
from quite different Places also. And how
 does he prove from St. Luke, that our Savi-
 our ascended from different Places? Why,
In the Gospel St. Luke assures us, that the
former Ascension was from Bethany, 15 Fur-
longs from Jerusalem; and in the Acts he as-
pires us, that the latter was from Mount
Olivet, no more than 5 Furlongs from Jerusa-
lem. Now those Commentators, who make no
 difference between Bethany and Mount Oli-
 vet, between Fifteen Furlongs and Five Fur-
 longs, especially in the same Evangelist, seem
 to me not very fit to assail the Difficulties of
 the Sacred Writings, nor to reconcile Man-
 kind to a due Opinion of the Care and Accu-
 racy of the Penmen of them. Still I am
 more and more amazed at this strange Au-
 thor, who cannot forbear reflecting with
 a haughty Air of Contempt, upon other
 Writers, whilst he himself is so grossly in the
 wrong, and so notoriously obnoxious to
 Censure.

p. 286.

Most certain it is, that there were two Bethany
 Bethanies; viz. Bethany the Town, and ^{part of} Mount O-
 T Bethany liver.

Bethany the Hill ; as is very evident from *John* 11. 1, 18. compared with *Mark* 11. 1. and *Luke* 19. 29. They came nigh to Jerusalem unto Beth-phage, and Bethany το δεος τῆς ἐλαιῶν at the Mount of Olives and he came nigh εἰς Βηθφαγήν καὶ Βηθανίαν το δεος το καλέμενον Ἐλαιῶν, to Beth-phage and Bethany, at the Mount called the Mount of Olives ; So then we read of a Bethany at the Mount of Olives, a Sabbath-Day's Journey or Five Furlongs from Jerusalem, *Acts* 1. 12. and of a Town named Bethany, Fifteen Furlongs from Jerusalem, *John* 11. 18. For, as part of Mount Sinai was called Horeb, and part of Mount Hor was called Mosera, so part of Mount Olivet was called Bethany. I say, Part of Mount Olivet had the Name of Bethany ; and Beth-phage was a Tract of Ground with some Houses upon it, which reached from the Walls of Jerusalem, as far as where that part of Mount Olivet began, which was called Bethany ; and the part of Mount Olivet was the Bethany from which our Lord ascended, after that he had led his Disciples so far, and Blessed them there. Now one who is so little skill'd in Scripture-Chorology, as not to know that two distinct Places were called by the same Name of Bethany ; seems to me not very fit to assail the Difficulties of the Sacred Writings, nor to reconcile Mankind to the due Opinion of the Care and Accuracy of the Penmen of them.

Beside

Mr. Whiston's Quotation from St. Barnabas, no Proof of his Point.

Besides his pretended Proof from St. Luke, That our Lord rose and ascended on the same Day, he produces the Testimony of St. Barnabas and St. Jerome for his Opinion. St. Barnabas, says he, the Companion of St. Paul, called an Apostle by St. Luke and the Ancients, and said by St. Luke to have been a Good Man, and full of the Holy Ghost, and of Faith, does almost as directly affirm the same thing as St. Luke himself, in his Genuine Epistle still extant: For giving the Reason of the Christians Observation of the First or Eighth Day of the Week; he affirms it to be because Christ rose from the Dead on that Day, and because on the same Day when he had appeared to his Disciples, he ascended up into Heaven. His Words are these, *Αὐτὸς καὶ ἀνοήσεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὁυδὸν εἰς ἐνδοχὴν τοῦ ἡ. καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστην ὡς νεκρῶν καὶ φανερώσας ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς ἑπτάς.* And is this one single Place of St. Barnabas any Proof that our Lord ascended on the Day of his Resurrection? Why is Mr. Whiston so vain a Man, as to quote this Passage from St. Barnabas's Epistle against the Faith of the Ancient Church, and of the Church in all Ages? His main Advice for the Study of Divinity is this, that we should hold no Doctrine in Revelation, but what we can ground up on the Holy Scriptures, expounded by the Faith of the first Ages after the Scriptures

were written; and that same Advice should be followed in expounding St. *Barnabas's* Catholick Epistle, which he gave for expounding the Scriptures. Why then hath he offered to prove a Doctrine from St. *Barnabas's* Epistle, that doth not agree with the Sense of the Primitive Fathers? For let Mr. *Whiston* (if he can) produce one Father in the first, second, or third Centuries, who believed that the Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord were on the same Day; or who ever quoted St. *Barnabas's* Epistle in Proof of it. Never was there Ecclesiastical Canon, Decree, or Constitution; never any Act of a Synod, for the Observation of the Sunday-Festival, where the Ascension of our Lord as on the same Day, enters into the Reason for the Jerusalem Observation of it: Never was there any Creed, or any Explication of a Creed, in which this Doctrine was found; and if Divine, I am persuaded, from the Apostolick Age down to this present, was not known to be of Mr. *Whiston's* Opinion, till this thing before.

Whence it necessarily follows, that it must have been the Constant and Universal Opinion, either that the Epistle attributed to St. *Barnabas* was not his, and truly spurious; or if it was esteemed Genuine, accounted to have been written by him, that the particular quoted Place is

rup

rupted ; or if granting it was not corrupted,
that it hath been fairly capable of bearing a
better Construction than Mr. *Whiston* hath
put upon it : Or if it cannot be otherwise
interpreted, that then the thing asserted by
St. Barnabas therein is false.

As to Mr. *Whiston's* Quotation from St. *Jerome*, the Passage in his Margin he quotes here as from St. *Jerome*, was never that Father's at all. Let but Mr. *Whiston* consult * *Robert Cocus's* Censure of some Writers, and there he will find that several great Men, for very great Reasons, have rejected the Comments upon the *Psalms* ascribed to St. *Jerome*, as altogether Supposititious and Spurious; viz. *Sixtus Senensis*, *Arnoldus Morbachi*, *Canus*, *Erasmus*, and

The Place
quoted as
from
St. Je-
rome,
Spurious.

Puto hunc locum esse corruptum. *Hugo Menardus*. But if the Place was not corrupted at all, the same Learned Man expounds those Words χ *καταπαύσας αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, thus, & cum apparuisset, ascendit ad cœlos, cum apparuisset per quadraginta dies, videlicet, postea ascendit ad cœlos. And so Bishop Fell, and Bishop Wake, likewise interpret that Expression; χ *καταπαύσας, cum apparuisset; Our Lord's having been made manifest or known to his Disciples, may well refer to the Forty Days of his conversing with them. Mr. Wright's Remarks on the Ascension, p. 6, 7. Hic videtur dicere Christum Ascendisse in eundem die Dominicâ, imò eodem die quo resurrexit, quod falsum est. But Menardus interprets St. Barnabas otherwise, and not according to the bare Surface of his Words.**

en by Censura quorundam Scriptorum quæ sub nominibus
ace is torum, & veterum Auctorum citari solent. *Auctore*
erto Coco.

Lindanus : Also I refer Mr. *Whiston* to *Martianay's* Preface to *St. Jerome* on the *Psalms*, Fol. *Paris*, 1699.

If a Man that liv'd in a more obscure Corner of the World, and could not easily come at Books, should write and quote after this careless Fashion, he might justly be blamed for his Rashness ; but, methinks, it is a shame for a Professor of an *University* who pretends to Learning, to discover such Ignorance in the midst of Books, and the best Helps for Knowledge : And for that Reason, I suppose, Mr. *Whiston* upon second Thoughts, saw good in his *Ascensions of Christ Reprinted*, to drop the Marginal Quotation from *St. Jerome*, and not to Reprint that.

Christ on
Earth, du-
ring the
Forty Days.

p. 286,
287, 297.

Having then shewn, as he thinks, from Scripture and other Testimonies, that *Christ* ascended on the Even of the Day of his Resurrection ; he proceeds to argue that our Lord ascended more than once, from the State he was in, and from the manner of his Behaviour and Conversation after he was risen from the Dead : He tells us, Our Saviour *did not converse then with his Disciples as before* ; and that's very true. And he says, *Our Lord did appear and disappear in such Circumstances after his Resurrection on all Occasions, as were wholly new and strange and no way agreeable to the State of his Body and Behaviour, while he was truly and pro-*

per-
muc
not
Earth
But
gene
ter h
dence
Earth
bitan
thing
our in
ter.
of the
in son
conve
Men,
This
Days
yet he
was n
of it.
I d
Earth
on the
asks, W
rally, fo
Answer
though
amongst
Mr. W
Two Q
per

perly an Inhabitant of this Earth. Now thus much I will grant, that our Saviour was not *truly and properly an Inhabitant of this Earth*, after he was risen from the Dead; But it follows not, that therefore he was generally in Heaven in the Forty Days after he was risen, or that *his ordinary Residence* was there *all that time*: For to be on Earth, and to be *truly and properly an Inhabitant of this Earth*, are very different things. The former was true of our Saviour in the Forty Days, though not the latter. To be *truly and properly an Inhabitant of this Earth*, is visibly to inhabit or sojourn in some part of it, and there familiarly to converse, and keep Correspondence with Men, as the Dwellers upon Earth do: This did not our Saviour in the Forty Days after he was risen from the Dead; but yet he was then on the Earth, though he was not *truly and properly an Inhabitant of it*.

I distinguish farther; To be on the Earth is one thing, To be ordinarily seen on the Earth is another. Mr. Whiston asks, *Where do we think our Lord was generally, for the Interval of Forty Days?* I Answer, He was somewhere on Earth, though he did not ordinarily shew himself amongst us. But I shall farther answer Mr. Whiston's Question, by asking him Two Questions more; viz. Where was our

P. 287.

Saviour after he vanished out of the Sight of the Two Disciples at *Emmaus*? Luke 24. 31. And where was He before he appeared to the Apostles in a Room, where the Doors were shut, *John* 20. 19, 26? Did he immediately ascend into Heaven after he vanished? Did he immediately descend from Heaven before he appeared? If not, then he continued on Earth even after he vanished, and on Earth he resided, even before he appeared: For though he was not ordinarily seen on Earth in the Forty Days, yet after he disappeared, and before he appeared, he was no less on Earth than while he appeared.

One would think Mr. *Whiston* might have asked rather, In what Part of the Earth mostly was our Saviour; in what Country, or Town, or House was his main Residence, during his Invisible Abode on Earth, for the greatest part of the Forty Days, whilst he was seen no where? And if that had been his Question, no Body could have well answered him.

John 20.
17. not in-
explicable
without
frequent
Ascensions.

Last of all: In his *Corollary*, at the end of his prior Dissertation upon frequent Ascensions, he Apologizes for his Singular Opinion, by pretending to shew, that an early Ascent of our Saviour, even soon after he was risen, was fit and proper for certain Ends; and chiefly by observing, that this Hypothesis is of special use for giving

giving *Light* to an hard Text, which otherwise he reckons *inexplicable*. He conceives that *Christ*, immediately on his Resurrection, was to ascend up to his Father in Heaven, to be inaugurated into his Kingdom, to begin his Office of *Intercession*; as if his Solemn Grand Ascension at the end of Forty Days, was not soon enough for those Purposes of his Inauguration and Intercession; and his Ascension was so hast'ned, that he might receive his Commission and Instructions for the future Management of his Kingdom. p. 199.

The *Socinians* are of Opinion, that our Lord ascended up into Heaven some time before he began his Ministry, and was with God a while there, to have Revelations and Instructions from him, with reference to that Work and Business for which he was to be sent into the World; and also to receive full Authority and Commission, to Execute his Great Office: Even so Mr. *Whiston* imagines, that our Lord ascended into Heaven before the Forty Days were expired, to receive his Commission and Instructions for the future Management of his Kingdom. And truly, both Fancies are groundless and absurd alike.

And then moreover, he recommends his New Hypothesis upon the Account of its Usefulness for the Explication of a difficult Passage, (as he calls it) which otherwise, he says, must have remained unexplained

explained till Doom's-Day: For hence we may derive some Light upon that hitherto inexplicable Place which we meet with in St. John; I mean, our Saviour's Words to Mary Magdalene, very soon after he was risen: Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father. This Expression upon the common Hypothesis is exceeding strange, it seeming so contradictory to what might have been in Reason expected. And again, Our Account of our Lord's frequent Ascensions gives to, and receives great Light and Confirmation from, this difficult Passage, which otherwise appears to be truly inexplicable.

p. 300.

Had he only said, That this Text of Scripture had not yet been explained to any purpose, till he was so lucky as to hit upon the only Thing that open'd its Meaning, his Confidence in asserting so much as that, could not have been altogether justified, and more Modesty wou'd have become him better: But to say, Not, that the Place was never explained before, but, that it is inexplicable, yea, TRULY inexplicable, without his Maggot of frequent Ascensions, is an unmannerly Stretch of Arrogance, which discovers his Conceitedness and his Ignorance to be much what alike. And yet after all it is manifest, that this Saying of our Saviour is far more easily explained upon the Common Hypothesis, than upon Mr. Whiston's.

The

The Place is, *Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father ; but go to my Brethren, and say unto them, I ascend to my Father, and your Father, and to my God, and your God : In which Words of our Lord to Mary Magdalene, Μὴ μου ἅπτει, Touch me not,* are not Words of Prohibition, as if it were not lawful for her to touch him after his Resurrection ; but rather of kind Notice and Information, to signify to her that it was not needful to do it, but might better be let alone at that time : For we read that afterwards *Mary and others held him by the Feet, and worshipped him, without being blamed at all for so doing, Matth. 28. 9.* When at one of his Appearances to his Disciples they were terrified and affright'ned, and supposed that they had seen a Spirit, he takes off their Fears of that sort, by bidding them touch him : For he said unto them, *Why are ye troubled, and why do Thoughts arise in your Hearts ? Behold my Hands and my Feet, that it is I my self ; handle me and see, for a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones as ye see me have, Luke 24. 37, 38, 39.* And instead of forbidding Thomas to touch him, he said to him likewise, *Reach hither thy Finger, and behold my Hands ; and reach hither thy Hand, and thrust it into my Side,* John 20. 17. and he did eat and drink with the Apostles after he rose from the Dead, Acts 10. 41.

John 20.
17. ex-
plained.

The

The Case was this : *Mary Magdalene*, to whom our Lord directs his Speech when he was newly risen, was very forward and eager to approach him with all possible Expressions of Homage and Adoration, the first time she saw him after his Resurrection, as fearing that perhaps she should never see him more in this World ; and that if she did not touch him then, she should *not do it afterward*. This our Lord perceiving, said unto her, *Mary, Touch me not* ; that is, forbear touching me at present, for there is no need of doing it now ; *For I am not yet ascended to my Father*, I am to make some stay upon Earth before I go to my Father ; and so there will be other Opportunities of touching me ; and new Occasions for so near an Access to handle and embrace me, will be administred again and again : Therefore spend no time in doing what is needless at present, but rather hasten to my Disciples, who at this time want to be comforted, more than thou dost to touch me ; *and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, and to my God, and your God* ; that is, say unto them, I who am risen, not to a worldly Life, am indeed to ascend to my Father and theirs, and to my God and theirs, after a while, though not now at this present ; shortly, but not suddenly. And this, I do say, is the easy, obvious, and natural Sense of the

Words

Wor
why
after
cende
ascen
neve
ascen
furth
but
Mary
that
have
ascen
coulo
shoul
ding
quen
touch
he w
Bu
reprin
Argu
those
with
have
deal
py
Trut
Fals
but
to fa
lackin

Words. And seeing the very Reason given why *Mary* needed not to touch our Lord just after he was risen, was this, *I am not yet ascended to my Father*; that is, he was not to ascend presently: It is very strange, that nevertheless he should be thought to have ascended that Evening. Nay, this Place further shews, That *Christ* was to ascend but once: *Touch me not*, says our Lord to *Mary*, for *I am not yet ascended to my Father*; that is, do not touch me now, you will have time enough to do that before I shall ascend. Which clearly impliyes, that there could be no touching of our Lord, after he should be once ascended; Whereas according to Mr. *Whiston's* Hypothesis of frequent Ascensions, our Lord might be touched, even after he ascended, because he was to descend again.

But then in his *several Ascensions of Christ* reprinted with Enlargement, he adds other Arguments for maintaining his Point; and those Arguments are just of the same sort with, and no better than, those which I have refuted already. And what a great deal of ridiculous Pains doth this unhappy Man take to make that look like a Truth, which is certainly a most evident Falshood; catching at every thing that doth but seem to appear for him, and drawing it to favour his Hypothesis: And what is lacking of Strength in his Arguments con-

sider'd

No Ascension of Christ on the Morning of his Resurrection.

sider'd in themselves, he endeavours to make up in the weight of their Number; that so many of them together may amount at least to some Appearance of a Proof; that his new Doctrine is true. Now he alters and corrects his Proposition first, and then offers to prove it farther by another Set of Arguments, such as they are.

PROPOSITION.

Our Blessed Saviour ascended up into Heaven several times after his Resurrection; particularly Twice that very Day on which he rose from the dead; Once in the Morning, and again in the Evening of the same Day.

Serm. &
Essays.
P. 145

His Arguments whereby he would prove a Morning Ascension, shewed to have nothing in them.

He told us before, That for certain Our Blessed Saviour ascended up to Heaven the Evening of that very Day on which he rose from the Dead. Here we have a Morning Ascension too; and his Proposition thus mended, he proves four Ways, viz. From an Old-Testament Type; and From one of our Saviour's Predictions before his Death and Resurrection; and From a certain Saying of our Saviour after he was risen from the dead; and From certain Things our Saviour did after his Resurrection; which according to Scripture Accounts of Matters, he

was

was not to do, till he had ascended first. I do not place his Arguments in his Order: For I have observed in his Writings, that he is not always very Methodical. As he has a cloudy, so sometimes he has a rambling Head, and he is as little Master of Method, as he is of Reason and Argument. For,

1. He says, That our Lord ascended up into Heaven, very soon after his Resurrection, that Morning, is very probable, because the Nature of our Saviour's Priestly Office required this sudden Ascension into Heaven, as soon as his Sufferings were over. The High Priest among the Jews was the most solemn Type of our Saviour, as the High-Priest of his Church. Now the High-Priest, as soon as ever the He-Goat, the Sacrifice for the whole Congregation, was slain on the Great Day of Propitiation, did immediately, and without Delay carry its Blood into the most Holy Place, and sprinkle it before the Mercy-seat, and thereby compleat the Attonement, and make Intercession for the People: and till he had done so, he was not looked on as having finished the Work of that Solemnity. This Typical Passage, if it proves any thing to the purpose for which he quotes it, proves too much, that is, more than he would have believed; to wit, That our Lord rose and ascended together. For as the High Priest, soon as ever the He-Goat, the Sacrifice for the

Levit. 16.
15. &
Heb. 1.3.
improperly
quoted for
Mr. WHI-
STON's
Purpose.

the

P. 146.

the whole Congregation, was slain on the Great Day of Propitiation, did immediately and without Delay carry its Blood into the most Holy Place, and sprinkle it before the Mercy-Seat: So our Lord, the High-Priest of his Church, was immediately and without Delay to mount strait up from the Grave to Heaven. And the Quotation from St. Paul to the Hebrews, which he annexes to the Type, proves still more than the Type it self. Accordingly St. Paul joins these Two Parts of our Saviour's Priesthood together, Having by himself purged our Sins, He sat down on the Right-hand of the Majesty on high. For if there be any Proof of a speedy Ascension from this Text, it proves that our Lord after he had suffered and was really dead, and so, as soon as the Sacrifice of his sufferings, and Death on the Cross, by which he purged our Sins, was over, He revived and ascended up immediately, no Burial or Resurrection from the Grave intervening. And is it not a fine way of proving that our Lord ascended very soon after his Resurrection, that Morning, to prove this by the Type, and Heb. 1. 3. that by Two such Scripture-Testimonies, which if they be any thing to the purpose he quoted them for, do prove that Christ ascended sooner than he will allow of; since the Former, as he interprets Levit. 16. 15. proves at least that Christ rose and ascended with

out
betw
of C
ascen
Cros
or R
2.
foreto
Absen
and bu
This
ny suc
Lord
while,
le whi
he Fat
ime o
n, w
osed
us D
is Rel
is Dea
is Dea
ys he
e, and
e me;
* I
It is n
see me,
blence fr
le while
o

out Stop or Stay, or speaking to any one between the Sepulchre and the Right-hand of God ; and the Latter proves, That he ascended even as soon as his Sacrifice on the Cross was finished, without any Interment, or Resurrection at all ?

2. Our Lord Himself, just before his Passion, John 16. foretold this sudden Ascent to the Father, and 16. per- Absence from his Apostles for a little while, Mr. WHI- and his as sudden Descent again to them after it. STON. This is false : For our Lord never foretold a- P. 149. ny such thing. Yes, says our Author, our Lord foretold it in these Words ; *Tet a little John 16. while, and ye shall not see me, and again a lit- 16, 17. tle while and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father.* Now it is most plain, that the little time our Saviour speaks of in this Prediction, was not the little time between his supposed Ascents and Descents ; or between his Disappearances and Appearances after his Resurrection, but only the little time to his Death, and again the little time between his Death and Resurrection : *A little while,* says he to his Disciples, *and ye shall not see me, and again a little while and ye shall see me ; and, Because I go to the Father ; that* * I must tell you it will not be long before

U

* It is not said by our Saviour, *A little while and ye shall see me, Because I go to the Father ;* as if he spake of his absence from them by an Ascent to the Father, and the little while were the short Space between Ascent and Descent

fore I be taken from you by Death ; but I must tell you withal, that I shall soon rise again after my Death, in order to ascend to Heaven : For I must go to the Father ; but before my Ascension to Him, I shall see you first to your great Joy. And the short Sorrow of his Disciples at his Death, He compares to the Care of a Woman in Travel, whose Sorrow soon ends in Joy. For when they were desirous to know of him his Meaning in those Words, *A little while, and ye shall not see me, and again a little while and ye shall see me* ; He said unto them, *Do you enquire among your selves of that I said, A little while and ye shall not see me, and again a little while and ye shall see me ? Verily, verily, I say unto you, that ye shall weep and lament, but the World shall rejoice ; and ye shall be sorrowful, but your sorrow shall be turned into Joy. A Woman, when she is in Travel hath sorrow because her hour is come, but as soon as she is deliver'd of the child, she remembreth no more the anguish, for Joy that*

scent : No ; but again a little while and ye shall see me, Because I go to the Father ; that is, I shall not lie long in the Grave but shall see you soon again, because I must rise to ascend shortly to my Father ; Those Words, *Because I go to the Father*, have respect only to the Latter, not to the former Branch of the Prediction ; and are the Reason, not why it should be a little while, and they should not see him ; but why again it should be a little while and they should see him.

man is born into the World ; and ye now therefore have sorrow, but I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your Joy no man taketh from you. When our Lord was suffering on the Cross, the People that passed by, reviled him, wagging their heads; and the Chief Priests with the Scribes and Elders mocked him; they insulted over him in his Extremity; and when they had killed him, they rejoiced and triumph'd, as having gain'd their Point; and all the while his Followers mourned and wept, Mark 16. 10. But after his Resurrection, the Sorrow of his Disciples was turned into Joy, and the Triumph of his Enemies into Confusion; and so this Simile of the Sorrow of a Woman in Travel, clearly confutes Mr. Whiston's Pretence, That the short Space meant in the Prediction, *A little while, &c.* was the time between his sudden Ascent to the Father, and Absence from his Apostles, and his as sudden Descent again to them after it: For when the Apostles had seen our Lord alive again, their Sorrow on the Account of his Death, like the Anguish of a Travel, was quite at an End: After they had once seen him, they sorrowed no more; no, not when he disappeared, and left them a while. If we compare all this Prediction of our Saviour's with the Event, How sad and disconsolate the Disciples were on our Saviour's Death, and how joyful they were soon after his Resurrection;

p. 150.

and consider that this sorrow was to last till Christ had been with the Father, and then the Joy to commence, as we have just now seen; we shall be inclined to believe, as the Proposition asserts, That our Lord went to his Father immediately after his Resurrection, and yet in a very little while saw them again upon his Descent, viz. the very same Day in the Evening. That the Disciples were sad and disconsolate on our Saviour's Death, and joyful soon after his Resurrection, is certain; but what this Author says next is false and ridiculous, viz. That this sorrow was to last till Christ had been with the Father, and then the Joy to commence: This is directly contrary to the Account which we have of Things in the History of our Lord's Resurrection.

Joy amongst
Christ's
Disciples
before he
ascended.

When Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, were very early in the Dawn of the Day at the Sepulchre, and an Angel told them that Jesus was risen, they departed quickly from the Sepulchre with Fear and GREAT JOY, and did run to bring his Disciples the Word, Matth. 18. 8. And surely the Great Joy of the Two Maries, must commence even before the supposed Morning Ascension. Again when one of the Maries, Mary Magdalene, stood without the Sepulchre weeping, and Jesus stood near her, whom at first she supposed to be the Gardiner, and said unto her, Touch me, for I am not yet ascended to my Father; W

John 20.

not she glad at the heart to see the Lord, when he said to her, *Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father* ? Did not HER JOY commence till he had been with the Father ? So we read, That *the Disciples were* Joh. 20. 20. *glad when they saw the Lord* ; And was it not Cause enough for their rejoycing, that they saw him Alive, after he had been Dead and Buried, unless he had been with the Father first before they saw him ? So long as they saw him when he was risen, it was all one to them whether he had ascended or not ; they rejoiced to see him, without knowing any thing of that Matter, or Enquiring about it : For the supposed Morning-Ascension they saw not, and Mary neither informed them, nor was to inform them of any such Thing. In the Evangelical History we read of Two distinct Joys of the Apostles after Christ's Death : The one was at his Resurrection, *John 20. 20. Then were the Disciples glad when they saw the Lord*. The other at his Ascension, *Luke 24. 52. And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great Joy*. And yet Mr. Whiston says, That the Apostles had no Joy till Christ's Ascension, but *their sorrow was to last till Christ had been with the Father, and then the Joy was to commence*. Whereas it is most manifest, that the Joy commenc'd at his Resurrection, before his Ascension, tho' a Greater Joy commenced at his Ascension. And for all the

Nonsense of this Assertion, That the sorrow of the Apostles at Christ's Death, was to last till **Christ** had been with the Father, and then the Joy to commence, still our Author is positive, that he is Right in his Gloss on the Prediction; and he adds, *Neither indeed do I know of any other Sense, that can be fairly put upon these Words, A little while, &c.* but (I add) his very absurd one.

The Error
of Mr.
WHI-
STON'S
Criticism
on Luke
24. 26.
Ascensi-
ons reprin-
ted.

P. 153.
Luke 24.
26.

3. There is not wanting some farther Evidence, that our Lord did really ascend on the Resurrection-Day in the Morning, even from his own Words that Afternoon in the Journey to Emmaus; Ought not **Christ** to have suffered these things already, and already to have entred into his Glory? $\pi\alpha\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ & $\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ are both of the same Aorist, and ought to have been rendred in the same manner. Here the Argument is from a Criticism, but a very unlucky one: $\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ ought to have been rendred to have entred, as well as $\pi\alpha\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ to have suffered, being both of the same Aorist. And therefore they ought to have been rendred in the same Manner, tho' our English Version be partial, and dares not do it; because the Interpreters believed the one to be past, and the other future. In that Version 'tis thus: **Ought not Christ to have suffered?** of a thing already past; and to enter into his Glory? as of a Futurity; contrary to the most obvious Importance of the Words. Then, according to our Critick, in the m

Natural and Genuine Import of Greek Words
the *Aorist* Tense is never used to signify a
Futurity: And yet we read that the *Aorist*
is so used in Prophecy, *to wit*, in our Sa-
viour's Prediction of his Death and Resur-
rection. *Matth. 16. 21.* Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο
ὁ Ἰησοῦς δεικνύειν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι δεῖ αὐ-
τὸν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, καὶ πολλὰ παθεῖν
ἀπὸ τῶν Πρεσβυτέρων καὶ Ἀρχιερέων καὶ Γραμμα-
τέων, καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερ-
θῆναι. Now what Stuff had the *English* been
if the Prediction had been all in the *Aorist*,
and rendred thus! *From that time forth began*
Jesus to shew to his Disciples, how that he
must have gone to Jerusalem already, and
must have suffered already, and must have
been killed already, and must have been
raised the third Day already? And what
a pretty Argument to prove a Morning-
Ascension is such a wise Criticism, as proves
that *Christ's* Death and Resurrection were
past, when they were foretold? *From that*
time forth began Jesus to shew to his Disci-
ples, ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν παθεῖν καὶ ἐγερθῆναι, That
he ought to have suffered, and ought to
have risen again? Any School-Boy, that
has learn't his *Greek Testament*, would be
asham'd to argue no better.

I observe, in Vindication of the Tran-
slators, against Mr. *Whiston*, That they
understand chiefly the intended Sense and
Meaning of *Greek Verbs*, and rendred them

Ἐισελθεῖν
Luke 24.
26. rightly
rendred,
to enter.

Several
Ascensi-
ons re-
printed.
p. 150.

accordingly, whether in their Versions they varied from the Original Tense, or not. And why doth he seem to blame Translators for using a Liberty, which he takes himself. *John* 16. 22. τὴν χαρὰν ὑμῶν, *Your joy no man αἶρει, taketh, or shall take from you, ἀπὸ ὑμῶν*: So he corrects the Version, tho' αἶρει be the Present Tense. So Νῦν ὑπάγω, *John* 16. 5. *I go my way to him that sent me*, might have been well enough rendred, *I shall go soon to him that sent me*, without keeping strictly to the Tense in the Greek. And I would have Mr. Whiston to know farther, That in *Luke* 24. 26. Ὁυ-
χὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, Παθεῖν & εἰσελθεῖν are both of the same Aorist; yet the Translators vary the Tense, Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his Glory. So on the contrary, in another Place relating to Christ's Ascension, to wit, in *John* 13. 3. Ἔιδως ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθε, καὶ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὑπάγει; ἐξῆλθε & ὑπάγει are different Tenses in the Greek; yet the Translators keep to the same Tense in the English; *Jesus knowing that he was come from God, and went to God*. And nevertheless all the while both Places are translated, not contrary to the most obvious, natural, and genuine Import of the Greek Words, but very properly and rightly; and there was no more need of rendring παθεῖν & εἰσελθεῖν

Luke

Luke 24. 26. in the same Manner in Respect of Tense, than of rendring ἐξῆλθε & ὑπάγετε, John 13. 3. in a different Manner.

And truly, what Mr. Whiston calls Partiality in the Version of Luke 24. 26. is to be esteemed the Care and Wisdom of it, for which the Translators are to be commended: Because Christ had suffered, they render παθεῖν to have suffered; and because he had not ascended, but was to ascend, they translated εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, not to have entred, but to enter into his Glory. And the Reason why they did not render εἰσελθεῖν to have entred, is not because they were partial, and so dared not do it, as he unworthily, not to say foolishly reflects, but because they could not do it without making their Version as errant Nonsense, as their Translation of the forementioned Prediction had been, if the ἀπελθεῖν, & παθεῖν, & ἀποκτανθῆναι, & ἔγερθῆναι there, had been rendred to have gone, to have suffered, to have been killed, and to have been rais'd already. Nay, what if the Translators had kept to the same Tense in the Place, as thus, Ought not Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his Glory? That Version had been true and good: For the same παθεῖν, which in the 26th Verse is rendred to have suffered, is in the 46th Verse rendred to suffer. Thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead

The Ver.
sion of
Luke 24.
26. vin-
dicated.

the

the third day; as likewise the Vulgar Latin Version, and Beza's Version of both Places is thus; *Nonne hæc oportuit pati Christum, & introire in Gloriam? ita oportuit Christum pati, & resurgere.* Ought not Christ to suffer? Or thus, *It behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise again, and to enter into his Glory.* And so the plain Sense of both Texts in the Original and Version, is this; According to the Prophecies of Christ's Death, and Resurrection, and Ascension, it behoved Christ to die and rise again, as he had done; and to enter into his Glory, as he was to do; and that Repentance and Remission of Sins should be preached in his Name among all Nations, as *ὅτι κηρύσσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν, καὶ ἀφεσὶν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* is rightly rendred. Mr. Whiston says, That he was not minded to lay any great Stress on such an Argument by it self, as the Criticism. I marvel how he could lay any Stress on it at all. And yet he lays a great Stress on 'Αναβέβηκα, John 20. 17. For he says, that by *ἐπεὶ ἀναβέβηκα. ὡς δὲ τὸ πατέρα μου*, can be meant, *I shall not yet ascend up to my Father, as some pretend, is impossible: No more impossible, than that by δὲ ἔχουσιν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν ἀποκτανθῆναι, καὶ ἐγερθῆναι*, in the Prediction, can be meant, That Christ was to suffer, and to be kill'd, and to rise again. And our Author might have criticiz'd on still after the same Manner: But go to my Brethren

Brethren, and say unto them, 'Avaβαίω, I ascend to my Father: That by 'Avaβαίω *ωρὸς τὸ πατέρα μὲν*, can be meant, I shall ascend to my Father, as some pretend, is impossible. For 'Avaβαίω is the Present Tense, and imports, That while our Lord was speaking to Mary, he must begin to ascend in that Minute, that so she might carry his Disciples Word, not only that she saw him when he was risen, but also that she left him actually ascending in her View.

I have already given the true Sense of those Words of our Lord to Mary, *Touch me not, &c.* I shall now vindicate and strengthen the common Interpretation of that Passage, by shewing the Folly of Mr. Whiston's, which it seems Dr. Whitby lik'd ne're the better for being a Novelty: For the Refutation of it, I thought good to reserve for this Place, and to bring in under this Head. The Expression in general, says Mr. Whiston, of *Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father, can I think mean nothing else, than that he was so very suddenly to ascend to his Father, as the immediate Consequence of his Death and Resurrection, that he had no time now for any usual Instances or Endearments of Conversation here on Earth, as being just then to go up to his Father in Heaven, before he could so much as visit his Disciples, and make his Personal Appearance to them. This is plain and clear Reasoning.*

Mr. WHISTON;
Gloss on
John 20.
17. not
warrantable; and
justly to be
rejected.

Yes

Yes indeed, This is as plain and clear Reasoning, as the rest of his Discourse on the several Ascensions: For all's alike. Now I observe, That the Proposition of his other Dissertation tells us of no other Ascension of *Christ*, on the Day of his Resurrection, than on the Evening of that Day. But he bethought himself, that unless it appears that our Saviour ascended on the Morning likewise, his Explication of *Touch me not, &c.* would be quite ruin'd, and not hold by any Means. For whereas it was betimes in the Morning, when our Lord said to *Mary*, *Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father*: If he did not ascend till the Evening, then our Saviour had almost a whole Day to turn himself about in after he was risen, and before he ascended; and consequently there was time enough for his being touched by *Mary*, and time enough too for visiting his Disciples before his supposed Ascension on the Evening of that Day. Wherefore Mr. *Whiston* being well aware, That a Morning-Ascension there must be, or else his Comment on *John 20. 17.* would be laugh't at; he therefore puts his Brains upon the Tenters to invent all the Arguments that possibly he could for proving; That our Saviour ascended twice in that very Day on which he rose from the dead, viz. in the Morning, as well as in the Evening of the same Day; and those Arguments

guments we have in his *Ascensions Reprinted*. P. 150.

Indeed one of his Arguments there to prove a Morning-Ascension is this, That *our Saviour, as soon as ever he was risen, told Mary Magdalene, That he was just then going up to the Father.* But this will not do for an Argument to prove his Point, because it is begging the Question: For his Exposition of *John 20.* does not prove a Morning-Ascension; but a Morning-Ascension must be proved, and presupposed, to justify and warrant his Exposition of that Place. For if there was no Morning-Ascension, if no such thing can be proved (and I am sure he has proved none; for all the Arguments he has devised to maintain his Second Proposition, are pitiful Trash) then his Explication of *John 20.* falls, and cannot pass for *plain and clear Reasoning*; forasmuch as our Saviour was not in such mighty Hast for ascending, that he could not be at leisure to receive *Mary's Touches*, and to make his *Personal Appearance* to his Disciples, before he ascended. He says, *Whether he ascended this Morning, or not, 'tis much more certain, That our Lord ascended up visibly into Heaven the Evening of that very Day on which he rose from the dead.* But if there was no Morning-Ascension, but only an Evening-one, what becomes of his Interpretation of *John 20. 17?* P. 153.

P. 147.
Sovereign-
ty Exerci-
sed by
Christ be-
fore his
Ascension.

4. 'Tis plain from the Types and Prophecies of the Old Testament, and from the Assertions of the New, that the Royal Power and Authority of the Messiah was to be the Fruit and Purchase of his Death, and the Effect of his Powerful Intercession at the Right Hand of God. Now, says Mr. Whiston, he exercised that Royal Power and Authority, that is, some of it, before his Final Ascension. Ay, and I must tell Mr. Whiston likewise, that he exercised some of the same Power before his Death and Resurrection. What are those Types and Prophecies of the Old Testament, and where are those Scripture-Accounts of Matters, from which it is plain that our Lord never exercised any Sovereign Power, till after his Ascension? Sure I am that the Scriptures in his Margin, p. 147, 148. say no such thing. And it is notoriously false, That every Act of Sovereign Power in our Saviour, was consequent on his Ascension, and the Fruit of his Intercession with God: He ordained Twelve Men to be his Ministers and Apostles; he sent them forth to preach the Gospel of his Kingdom, with this Order, *Heal the Sick, cleanse the Lepers, raise the Dead, cast out Devils*: He commanded with Authority the unclean Spirits, and he gave his Apostles Authority over them. Now surely, Conferring Honour upon Men selected out for special Services, sending forth Officers,

Matth. 10.
1, 4, 8.
Mark 1.
27.

Com-

Commanding with Authority, and Giving Authority, are Regal Acts, and Exercises of Sovereign Power; and all this Royal and Sovereign Power our Lord exercised *in the Days of his Flesh*. And therefore Mr. Whiston must not offer to say, That all Exercises of Sovereign Power in our Saviour must presuppose an Ascension; unless he pretends with the Socinians, That our Saviour, before he entred upon his Office as *Messias*, ascended up to God, and from him received full Power and Commission to execute his Mediatorial Office. For whereas Mr. Whiston mentions Four Exercises of Sovereign Power in our Lord after his Resurrection, which he attributes to his Ascension; I will shew, That our Lord, even before his Passion, exercised the very same Power in all the Kinds of it, though not in the same Degrees. As for Instance, After his Resurrection he gave the Apostles the Power of the Keys, to remit, and retain Sins; and he had promised the same Power to one of the Apostles before, *I will give to thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven*. After his Resurrection he commissioned his Apostles to preach and baptize all the World over: And they had received Commission before, to preach to the lost sheep of the House of Israel.

John 20.
23.

Matth. 16.
19.

Mat. 10.
6.

John 20.

21.

Mat. 10. 4.

16.

John 20.

22.

16. 7.

Israel. After his Resurrection the Apostles had this Mission, *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you*; and he had sent them before; *The Twelve Jesus sent forth: Behold I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves.* After his Resurrection *he breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost*; and he had promised them the Holy Ghost before. So then we see our Saviour promised the Power of Binding and Loosing to one of the Apostles separately from the rest, and gave them Commission to preach to the *Jews*; and he whom the Father had sent, sent them forth, and he made to them the Promise of the Comforter; and all these Exercises of Sovereign Power belong'd to our Saviour before his Passion and Resurrection. When he was risen from the dead, he exercised the same Supreme and Royal Power yet farther in the Four Instances of it. For the Power of the Keys he then gave to all the Apostles together; He then enlarged their Commission, That they should Teach all Nations, and *Preach the Gospel to every Creature*: Their Mission from him then was more solemn, *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you*; and he who had promised the Holy Ghost before, then gave them moreover an Earnest and Pledge of it, by breathing on them, and confirming his Promise by this Rite; That is to say, Our Saviour exercised his Sovereign Power differently accord-

ac
wh
diat
Hun
all t
was
In h
ction
of th
Degr
verei
cenfic
to be
high,
Comp
was a
Right
asking
sent I
Discip
onatio
earth:
reside
nat Po
as giv
e is ex
ame o
ings
ings u
l thing
And
rgume

according to the different States he was in, while he administered the Affairs of his Mediatorial Kingdom: Even in his State of Humiliation, he was not wanting to shew all that Royal Power and Authority, which was proper for him to exercise in that State. In his Middle-State, between his Resurrection and Ascension, he shewed still more of that Power, and exercised it in higher Degrees; but the highest Degrees of Sovereign Power were reserved for his Ascension into Heaven, when he was *exalted to be a Prince*: For when he *ascended up on high, he gave Gifts unto Men*, as having in Comparison given none before. When he was advanced to Sovereign Dignity at God's Right Hand, and *inaugurated into his Everlasting Kingdom* there, he scattered Magnificent Bounties and Largeesses amongst his Disciples and Followers; whereby his Coronation in Heaven was celebrated on Earth: and there above in Heaven he now resides and governs; there he exercises all that *Power in Heaven and on Earth*; which was given him at his Resurrection; there he is *exalted above every Name, That at the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things on Earth, and things under the Earth; and he is Head over all things to his Church.*

Acts 5.31.

And now Mr. Whiston having finished his arguments, whereby he shewed, *that our*

X

Lord

p. 166.

Lord ascended up into Heaven very soon after his Resurrection, that Morning, for the farther Establishment of his Proposition, proceeds next to answer Objections ; And indeed Error seldom goes without Objections against it. Yet he says, If it be expected, that I now answer such Objections as may be made against this Assertion, I must needs say, that abating Modern Prejudices, which I do not pretend to answer, I hardly know where to find any real Objections, which deserve very great Consideration. Well ; My Book, if I am not very much mistaken, furnishes him with real Objections enow against his Hypothesis which deserve his very great Consideration and are more than Objections against it for they are real Demonstrations, that his Doctrine of frequent Ascensions is very false.

*Arguments
against Mr.
Whiston's
Hypothesis,
disdained
by him as
Prejudices.*

But in answering Objections he will have nothing to do with Prejudices ; *Modern Prejudices* he must abate, those he will not pretend to Answer : All the Moderns are Blind but himself, and the plainest thing they can say to convince him that he is a Vain Novelist, he disdains as *Prejudices* and Arguments that he cannot answer, he calls Prejudices that he will not answer. But he says, *Only since I am aware of some things, that may cause Difficulty in this Matter, I will consider them a little in this Place.* And he has considered them but a very little indeed.

The first Objection he deals with, is <sup>The Argu-
ment from</sup> from Ἐφάπαξ, Heb. 9. 12. Neither by the ^{Ἐφάπαξ} Blood of Goats and Calves, but by his own <sup>not an-
swered by</sup> Blood, he entred **once** into the Holy Place, ^{him.} having obtained Eternal Redemption for us. This Expression, that he entred in **once** into the Holy Place, at the first sight, looks not so favourably on the Proposition before us. True: Yet the Objection he values not, as if it were nothing; he abounds with Answers to it, he fills Four Pages with his Answers, and triumphs, that by the last of them he has silenced the Objection forever. In good Truth, A Man would think that this Passage of St. Paul, Heb. 9. 12. is a clear Proof of a Single Ascension of Christ, amongst divers other Testimonies which render the thing abundantly evident and certain. Nay, Mr. Whiston himself is forc'd to confess, that the one Death of Christ, of necessity supposes and infers but one Ascension of Christ; as he observes from the Apostle's Arguing in the Ninth Chapter to the Hebrews, Verses 7, 12, 25, 26. We see here that the Reason of this **Sin-** p. 167.
 gle entering into Heaven in the end of the World, was his once Suffering in the end of the World; and his once entering on his Intercession, depended on the Merits of his once Suffering for us. He but once the end of the World entred on his great Office of Mediation and Intercession for us, because
 X 2

*because he but once suffered in the end of the World, to capacitate himself for that Intercession and Mediation: How then doth Mr. Whiston solve the Ἐφάπαξ, so as to make his Doctrine of a single Ascension upon a single Death, consistent with his Doctrine of several Ascensions? Why, truly he tells us, That our Saviour's ascending on the Morning, or on the Evening of the Day of his Resurrection, was the once ascending, as being the Grand Ascension; in comparison to which other Occasional Entries afterwards may be counted for no Entries at all. I say, that this once entring into Heaven in the Text before us, appears by the Coherence to belong directly to the first and principal Entry into Heaven which was but once, without any Denial of any other occasional Entries; So that tho' he entred Twice, Thrice, or Four Times occasionally, yet still he entred but once; because this first and principal Entry into Heaven is not only an **entring once** in general, but such an Entry as immediately succeeded his Sacrifice and Death; tho' a Burial in the Grave and a Resurrection from thence intervened and was for the presenting his Blood before the Presence of the Divine Majesty, which indeed could be but once, because he died but once for Mankind. That is, Christ ascended but once in as much as he could ascend but once just after his Death, for the presenting his Blood before the Presence of the Divine Majesty*

For
ble
his
T
as h
And
ther
ing,
Place
post
once
cend
I say
mean
but o
and j
the e
put
Him
ven in
end of
our Gr
Hand
and F
Eight
are he
Autho
met w
is not c
every
For the
was the
Fo

For since he died but once, it was impossible that he should ascend immediately after his Death, any more than once.

This is one of his absurd Evasions, and, as he thinks, Solutions of the Difficulty. And another of his Answers is as bad, or rather a great deal worse: For by St. Paul's saying, that *Christ entred in once into the Holy Place*, he tells us, the meaning of the Apostle is, That he ascended not simply but once, or only at one time, but that he ascended only in one Age, not in every Age;

I say, that these Words of St. Paul do by no means imply what they are here alledg'd for; but only that our Saviour, as he did not come and suffer in every Age, but *ἀπαξ*, once in the end of the World, in its last Age, to put away Sin by the Sacrifice of Himself; So also did he not enter into Heaven in every Age, but *ἑφ' ἀπαξ*, once in the end of the World, in its last Age also, to be our Great Intercessor and Mediator at the Right Hand of God for ever. How many Errors and Falshoods are there in these Seven or Eight Lines? What an Heap of Mistakes are here together? In all my Readings of Authors, I scarce remember I have ever met with the like: *Christ's Suffering* once is not opposed by the Apostle to *Suffering* in every Age, but to *Suffering* in every Year: For the Solemn Feast of *Expiation*, which was the Thing he had been speaking of before,

fore, was an Anniversary Sacrifice. But *Christ* suffered only once, not Yearly: *Christ* suffered not often from the Foundation of the World; but now once in the end of the World hath he appeared to put away Sin by the Sacrifice of Himself. But he might have often suffered since the Foundation of the World, tho' he suffered but once in the End of the World; if by his Suffering once in the End of the World, was meant only his Suffering in but one Age of the World, because he might have often suffered in that Age.

Suppose *Christ* had suffered Ten Times in one and the same Age, he had suffered as often since the Foundation of the World, as if for Ten Ages together he had suffered once in every one of those Ages: If Mr. *Whiston* argues right, then there is no Necessity of gathering a single Death of *Christ* from the Apostle in this Place, but his Sacrifice of himself might have been repeated: For if *Christ* ascended once as he suffered once; and yet he ascended into Heaven but once, no otherwise than in one Age; which may consist with his ascending several Times in that Age; then likewise *Christ* suffered but once in no other Sense than what might consist with his Suffering several Times: And all the while the Chief Blunder which has misled Mr. *Whiston* into this false Reasoning, is his gross Mistake of

ἐν τῇ συντέλει τῆς αἰῶνος, in the end of the World; For he confounds two very distinct Things, viz. the Age of the *Messias* with an Age of the World, in the common Notion of it; or with the Age of Man, or the Time of Man's Life; and he makes no Difference between a *Dispensation* and a *Generation*: Whereas the Age of the *Messias* was to consist of many Ages and Generations. The συντέλεια τῆς αἰῶνος, was the last of the *Dispensations* in the World, not of the *Generations* of the World. For αἰών doth not always signify the Term of Man's Life, or one Generation of Men, as γένεα mostly doth; but sometimes it signifies a certain Duration of a State of Things, which may be for many Generations: Thus Dr. *Hammond* observes concerning the *Jews*, That they distinguished between the then present Age, and the Age of the *Messias* to come: As likewise Dr. *Whitby* in his Annotation on *Heb. 9. 26.* takes notice of the Three celebrated Ages of the World the Duration of it is divided into, according to the Tradition of *Elias*; to wit, the Age before the Law, and the Age of the Law, and the Age after the Law; or that of the *Messias*; which was the Consummation of the Ages before. Thus elsewhere the Apostle calls the Times of Christianity τὰ τέλη τῆς αἰῶνος, the Ends of the Ages. In the Preceeding Dispensations, God had all along

Annotation.
on Matth.
24.

1 Cor. 10.
11.

a constant Eye to the Times of the *Messias*: Christianity, the last of the Institutions, was the End of the Institutions that were given before it; Συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων, *Heb.* 9. 26, and Συντέλεια τῆς αἰῶνος, *Matth.* 13. 39, 40, 49. tho' both are rendred in the *English*, the *End of the World*, were yet meant to signify very different things: Συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων, in the Place to the *Hebrews*, is the Consummation or Conclusion of the Ages; that is, the Age of the *Messias*, which began with his Appearing, and is the last of the World: The Συντέλεια τῆς αἰῶνος in *St. Matthew*, is the Conclusion of that last of Dispensations, which is indeed the End of the World: For when *Christ* came he made a New Age or Dispensation by his Coming, and the last that ever should be; because it should not end but with the Dissolution of the World. But *Mr. Whiston* has interpreted Τέλη τῶν αἰώνων and Συντέλειαν τῶν αἰώνων, to mean, not the concluding Dispensation, but the concluding Age, or Generation of the World. For *1 Cor.* 10. 11. and *Heb.* 9. 26. are Two of his Texts in his *Essay on the Revelation*: From which, and divers other Scriptures of the New Testament he has put together, that are horridly wrested by him, he would maintain this impious Position, That the Apostles expected the Day of Judgment, and the End of the World, would come in their Age.

And

And how could Mr. *Whiston* dare to tell the World in Print, That our Saviour appeared, and entred into Heaven in the *last Age*; I mean in his Notion of Age, in which he hath pretended to prove, That the Apostles expected the World would end in their Time, and to answer the Objection from *Ἐφάπαξ*: For Mr. *Whiston*, and every Body else, knows, that there have been many Ages and Generations, since that Age of the World in which our Lord came, and suffer'd, and ascended. If this be not exposing our *Holy Religion to the Laughter of Infidels*, I know not what can be.

But I must not pass over his last Answer to the *Ἐφάπαξ*, upon which he lays the Chief Stress. *Lastly, To silence this Objection for ever, I say, that notwithstanding this ἀπαξ, this once entering of the High-Priest into the most Holy Place every Year; correspondently whereunto our Lord did Ἐφάπαξ, once in the end of World enter into Heaven it self; Tet it is certain, that the High-Priest did, strictly speaking, enter more than once every Year into that most Holy Place, tho' all upon the same Day of Propitiation.* p. 168.

Now I count my self obliged to make a particular Reply to this Answer, since he thinks he has quite silenced the Objection by it, and that for ever. The *High-Priest* entred in but upon one Day in the Year into the most Holy Place, which is the Apostle's meaning here by *once*,

once, tho' he four several Times that Day entred thereinto. Well, and what then? Why, accordingly in the present Case, did our Lord but in one Age of the World enter into Heaven for us, tho' he did several Times enter thereinto during the Forty Days after his Resurrection: To this I reply; It is certain that the High-Priest did several times enter into the most Holy Place on the Day of Expiation; and I believe no body would have deny'd it, tho' Mr. Whiston had not given us any of the Quotations in his Margin to prove it: But I utterly deny, That therefore, by our Saviour's being said *once* to have entred into the Holy Place, we are to understand no more than that he entred into Heaven but in one Age: and I deny as positively, that the several times of the High-Priest's entering into the most Holy Place on the Day of Expiation, were intended to pre-typify Mr. Whiston's imagined several Ascensions of Christ in the Forty Days. I say it is granted, That the High-Priest did enter into the Holy of Holies four several times on that Day, and for four several purposes; *Viz.* First to burn Incense; Then to sprinkle before the Mercy-Seat the Blood of the Bullock; Then to sprinkle the Blood of the Goat; and Lastly, to fetch the Censer and Cup that had been used for Incense, which were neither to be left in the most Holy Place, nor yet to be fetch'd away from thence,

thence, till the Sacrificial Service of the Day was over. Now the High-Priest's entring into the Holy of Holies once a Year, or but one Day in the Year, was a Figure of our Lord's entring into the Holy Place, Ἐφάπαξ, once for all ; a Year being a Revolution of Time that is most commonly understood. There the Type lay ; and not in the several Times of the High-Priest's entring into the Holy of Holies on that Day. The Reasons of those Four Entries are manifest ; but no Reason of the like sort can be assigned, why our Saviour should ascend more than once in the Forty Days. The Business of the first Entry was to burn Incense ; but was any thing that carried a Resemblance to Incense, or whereof that was a Figure, a Cause of our Lord's supposed first Ascension, before his other supposed Ascensions ? His bare Intercession with God for us, before his Presenting the Blood of his Sacrifice, could not be the Incense of his supposed first Entry, because his Intercession was founded upon his Sacrifice. And so likewise the Fourth Entry which was to bring out the Censer, was peculiar to the Annual *Expiation*, and belonged not to our Saviour at all : For did he at any time in the Forty Days go up to Heaven to fetch ought from thence, who went thither to abide there himself, and to sit down on the Right-hand of God ? As to the Two middle Entries of the High-Priest into the Holy of Holies ;

it is most evident, That they could not signify Two Ascensions of Christ, as I shall clearly prove from the Text, *Heb. 9. 12.* For there the Apostle expressly opposes Christ's *once* Entering into the Holy Place, to those Two Entries of the High-Priest into the Holy of Holies: *Neither by the Blood of Goats and Calves, τράγων καὶ μόρων, but by his own Blood he entred in once into the Holy Place, having obtain'd Eternal Redemption for us.* A Bullock and a Goat were the two Beasts that were Yearly offered in Sacrifice on the Feast of *Expiation*, and their Blood was sprinkled before the Mercy-Seat in the most Holy Place. Bulls and Goats were used in the Yearly Service of the *Expiation-Day*, as that Service was Yearly; but no more than One Bullock and One Goat were slain in the Year for Sacrifice on that Anniversary. And here then we see the Apostle takes Notice of a Double Entry of the High-Priest into the Holy of Holies; which he founds upon a Double Sacrifice they offered, *viz.* The Sacrifice of a Bullock, and the Sacrifice of a Goat. And he observes, That Christ entred into the Holy Place with a Single Sacrifice, even that of Himself; and so the *Ἐφάπαξ* is opposed not only to the High-Priest's Entering into the Holy of Holies every Year, on the Day of *Expiation*, but to the several Times of his entering there on that Day: For, in as much as ac-

cording

According to the Divine Institution of the Service on that great Solemnity, the Bullock and the Goat were not to be killed together, nor were their Two Bloods to be sprinkled before the Mercy-Seat together, but distinctly and separately, and at Two several Times; the High-Priest must therefore needs enter into the most Holy Place Twice; first with the Blood of the one, and afterwards with the Blood of the other: But *Christ* our High-Priest entred in but *Once* into the Holy and Heavenly Place, because he went thither with but One Blood; and he had no Blood to present there, but his Own. Wherefore Mr. *Whiston* must not think, that he has done the Business by his last Answer to the Objection from the *ἐφάπαξ*, and silenc'd it for ever: He is greatly mistaken. The Objection for all that Answer is still a very Sturdy one, and will not yield, nor be silenc'd. I may add another Consideration, from which it is evident, That the foretold Entry of the High-Priest into the Holy of Holies, on the Day of *Expiation*, could have no Typical Regard to *Christ's* Ascension; viz. The no Proportion at all between the Distance from the Outward Court to the Holy of Holies in the Tabernacle and Temple, and the Distance from Earth to that Heaven whither our Saviour ascended. It was very easy, yea nothing at all, for the High-Priest to move

move Four Times, nay Forty Times a Day to the most Holy Place, and from it again: But the Immense Distance of this World from the highest Heaven, could not so easily admit of several Ascents and Descents of *Christ* in Forty Days Space, much less in one Day: And to this Point I am coming to speak presently.

And besides the Ἐπαύρις, there is in his *Essay enlarg'd*, another Objection against his Hypothesis, which he saw fit to take some Notice of: And there is his Answer to it, with which I think it not worth the while to trouble the Reader. He says,

p. 169,
170.

These Two are the most considerable Objections I have met with; and how weak they are in Comparison of that express and positive Evidence I have above alledg'd for the present Assertion, I dare leave with the Impartial Reader to determine. And I dare leave with the Impartial Reader to determine, Whether any of those Arguments Mr. Whiston has used to prove a Morning and Evening-Ascension of Christ on the Day of his Resurrection; nay, Whether all of them together, do carry with them the least Degree of that Evidence he speaks of. It astonishes me, and I think it is enough to make one sick, to think, what that is which this Poor Man calls express and positive Evidence, and plain and clear Reasoning.

But

But there is a terrible Objection against his singular Opinion which he knew lay in his way, and which he was very sensible he must meet with, and encounter, and endeavour to give some Answer to, or nothing is done, and his New-built Hypothesis falls all to the Ground: And it is this, *That this frequent and sudden Ascent and Descent of our Lord, does by no Means suit with the Systeme of the World, nor with the Scripture-Expressions, That Heaven must be a Place at an Immense Distance from the Earth, even beyond the Reach of Astronomical Observations; and, That the Heaven, whither our Lord ascended, and where he now sits at the Right Hand of his Father, must be above the Sphere of the first Stars; because the Scripture not only says, He ascended into Heaven, or into the Heavens in the general; but that he ascended far above all Heavens; that he passed through the Heavens; and that he is made higher than the Heavens.* The Objection is fairly put, I confess; only the Ingenuity and Fairness of stating the Difficulty is presently spoiled again, by his falling foul upon those who should chance to make the Objection: For any such (whoever they be) must not pass with him for Philosophers or Divines. If this be objected, says he, *I shall take Leave to affirm, That such as make this Objection seem to me to have studied Nature*

The Argument against several Ascensions, from the Immense Distance between Earth and Heaven, not answer'd by Mr. WHISTON. Prior Dissert. P. 287, 288.

nor Scripture, as they ought to have done; and only to reason from vulgar Prejudices and common Opinions. Now, not valuing at all his Censure, who may count me what he pleases, I do profess my self to be one of those who are ready to object in this Manner: And I do say, that he has not answer'd the Objection; nay, I will positively say farther, That he can never answer it with all his Knowledge of Nature and Scripture; in which Knowledge, as appears by his arrogant way of Writing, he would be thought to equal, if not to excell, the most Learned of his Time.

No Help
from Na-
ture or
from Scrip-
ture for
answering
the Argu-
ment.

p. 291.
294.

First then, let us see what a Help Philosophy is to him for removing this Difficulty: As to Nature and Philosophy, they own no other Heavens, properly speaking, but those Airs or Atmo-spheres, which commonly, perhaps always, encompass the Planets: I mean principally, That Air or Atmo-sphere, which in particular environs our Earth. And there are Three Different Regions of the Air, The Lowest, the Middle, and the Highest: Whereas therefore, Christ is said to have ascended far above all Heavens, and to have passed thro' the Heavens, and to be made Higher than the Heavens; no more is meant thereby, than that Christ ascended up into the purest Regions of our Air, quite above all the Vapours, Meteors, Storms and Disorders of the lower and grosser Spaces of it, quite through

the
dle
Reg
no
asce
that
and
our
serv
the
Th
ties
gels
parte
belon
Abod
Order
gions
me, v
An
Philo
that c
haps
Indig
with
Script
by Sc
uens,
mosphe
out any
univers
great
the

the lowest Region under the Clouds, the middle Region among the Clouds, and the highest Region above the Clouds. So that we have no reason to think it strange, that our Lord p. 297. ascended and descended more than once, during that Forty Days space between his Resurrection and Final Ascension; since the utmost height of our Air, as far as appears from the best Observations, is but about 45 or 50 Miles from the Earth. In which invisible Air all the Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, Powers, Archangels, and Angels, Good and Bad, with the Souls of departed Men; in short, all Invisible Beings belonging to this World seem to have their Abode, every one in their several Degrees and Orders. And to this highest of the Three Regions, to this Third Heaven, as it seems to me, was St. Paul carried.

And this is expounding Scripture by Philosophy; and if this be all the good that comes of his Studying of Nature, perhaps some can hardly forbear saying with Indignation, **His Philosophy perish with him.** Well, but he hath studied Scripture also, and he expounds Scripture by Scripture too: For the Scriptures, Heavens, as he tells us, are that Air or Atmosphere which is expanded above us, without any regard to the remoter parts of the Universe at all: When we meet with Cities great, and fenced up to Heaven; or

with Brimstone and Fire sent from the Lord out of Heaven; and the Fire of God falling from Heaven: When we read of Thunder or Lightning sent from Heaven, of the Voice of God from Heaven, of the Dew of Heaven, of Bread from Heaven, of an Heaven of Brass over Men's Heads, of the Ends of Heaven, the Windows of Heaven, the Fowls of Heaven, or Water above the Heavens: When also we observe the Expressions, that the Heavens were opened, that Heaven was red and lowring, that the Son of Man is to come in the Clouds of Heaven, and the like; I suppose no Body at this time of Day imagines any thing beyond the Air to be meant by that Word. Yet however, he says, that he takes the Air which environs our Earth not to be ever meant, but almost always meant by Heaven in the Sacred Dialect. He owns therefore that an higher Sphere than Air or Atmosphere, is sometimes though not so frequently, meant by Heaven in the Sacred Dialect.

And that being granted by him, I will undertake to demonstrate, that when Christ is said to have ascended far above Heavens, and to have passed through the Heavens, and to be made higher than the Heavens; by that highest Place to which Christ hath ascended far above all Heavens

Eph. 4. 10.

Heb. 4. 14.

7. 26.

and
Hea
than
Air,
of i
vast
serva
O
bold
third
himse
That
ted w
hence
the s
cient
Conver
then
stant I
all Pa
Warra
firm th
did our
and ye
fewish
opened,
Right
HAND
ons? I
ven, so
aculou
no high
an

and to which he hath passed through the Heavens, and in which he is made higher than the Heavens; cannot be meant the Air, no, not the highest and purest Region of it; but a remoter Part of the Universe, vastly out of the reach of Astronomical Observation.

Only first I shall take some notice of his bold Assertions of this sort, That from the third Region of the Air our Lord did shew himself to St. Stephen and St. Paul; That hither was Enoch and Elias translated without seeing Death; nay, That from hence did come, and hither frequently return, the same Blessed Messiah, when in the Ancient Ages of the World, he was so frequently Conversant among Mankind, though he was not then Incarnate, or become a proper and constant Inhabitant of this Earth: Which are all Paradoxes; and this Author hath no Warrant from Nature or Scripture, to affirm these things. He says, From this Place did our Lord shew himself to St. Stephen; and yet the Proto-martyr declared in the Jewish Counsel, Behold I see the Heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the Right Hand of God. Is then the RIGHT HAND of God in any of the Aerial Regions? Is that Glorious and Beatific Heaven, so call'd in Scripture, which was miraculously seen by St. Stephen, no other, and no higher than the Third Region of the

Mr. Whiston's Paradoxes about Enoch, Elias, St. Stephen, p. 295.

Acts 7.56.

Air? This is abominably false, as I shall observe again presently ; And from the same Place *did our Lord shew himself to St. Paul*. That's as false as the other : For surely our Lord appeared to St. *Paul*, not from the highest Region of the Air, but in the lowest of the Three ; for our Lord came down so far as the first Region, or the lowest Heaven, that is contiguous to our Earth, when he was seen of St. *Paul*. In the Air under the Clouds, was the Glorious Light above the Brightness of the Sun, which suddenly shined round about St. *Paul*, and those that journeyed with him, and struck them all to the Ground. In that Air was the Person that appeared to St. *Paul* ; there was the Voice that spake to him. In a Word, the whole Wonder was transacted in our Region ; as Mr. *Whiston* had himself confessed before, but it seems he had forgot it : Says he, *from this Place* (the highest of the Three Regions) *did our Lord shew himself to St. Stephen and St. Paul*, without any descending farther to be seen of them. But when Mr. *Whiston* would shew from the Instance of our Lord appearing to St. *Paul* after his Ascension that the *Ἐφάπαξ* cannot be interpreted to exclude his Occasional Descent and Ascent after his Resurrection, then he was obliged to contradict himself, by supposing quite another thing ; viz. that the *Ἐφάπαξ* did not

Acts 26.
13, 14.

Ascens. Re-
print. P.
168.

Prior. Dis-
sert. P.
295.

Ascens. Re-
print. P.
176.

bin
far,
is,
En
Dea
Hol
Did
so ?
to
Mar
hith
De
Wor
Man

It i
sinefs
Air be
Child
the Pro
mitted
raelite
justify
Now t
the C
Michae
in Mr
or one
Messias
Herefi
his Me
was p
be his
did he
Messia
they w
that th

hinder but that our Saviour might Descend so far, as to be seen by St. Paul. Hither, that is, to the Third Region of the Air, was *Ascens. Re-* Enoch and Elias translated without seeing *print. P.* Death. And did God translate those two ^{167, 168.} Holy Men no higher, than to that Region? Did he take them no nearer to himself than so? This is a wild Conceit, that I am apt to think never entred into the Heart of Man before: Nay, from hence did come, and hither frequently return, the same Blessed *Messias*, when in the Ancient Ages of the World, he was so frequently Conversant among Mankind, though he was not Then Incarnate.

It is one of Mr. Whiston's Notions, that part of the Business and Office of the *Messias* in the Third Region of the Air before his Incarnation, was to protect and defend the Children of Israel: For he says in his *Accomplishment of the Prophecies*, p. 187. That the Idolatrous Nations were committed to no higher Protectors than Inferior Angels, while the Israelites were under the Care of the *Messias* himself; and to justify his Opinion, he quotes *Dan. 10. 13. and 12. 1.* Now for a Proof that the *Messias* was Tutelar Guardian of the Children of Israel, to quote such Texts as say, that *Michael* was chief Prince over them, seems to imply that in Mr. Whiston's Opinion, the *Messias* was an Arch-Angel, or one of the Superior Order of Angels; nay, that the *Messias* and *Michael* are one and the same, which are horrid Heresies. Neither can he well come off by pretending his Meaning only to be this, That *Michael* the Arch-Angel was particularly deputed and entrusted by the *Messias*, to be his Vice-Prince over his People Israel: For why then did he say, That the Israelites were under the Care of the *Messias* himself? And why did he go about to prove, that they were under the Care of the *Messias* himself, by shewing that they were under *Michael's* Care?

Of all his Paradoxical Assertions, which he has strangely put together here, this last I dislike most, because it smells rank of *Arrianism*. According to this Hypothesis, the *Messias* was not *God manifest in the Flesh*, but rather a Creature Incarnate, since he was not a Glorious Being in the highest Heaven, but only an Inhabitant of the Air before his Incarnation, and thither he was to *ascend up, where he was before*: And yet our Author's silly Conceit, that the Third Region of the Air is the Place of the Residence and Abode of the *Messias*, doth not agree with the *Arrian* Hypothesis neither; for the *Arrians* hold that *Christ* is a Creature Super-Angelical. If then *Christ* be above the Angels, yea, *exceedingly advanced above them all*, why does Mr. *Whiston* place him in the supposed Region of Angels, and not in a Region superior to theirs? Nay, he seems to say repugnant things in the very same Page, 295. For he tells us, that the Blessed *Jesus sits at the Helm of the whole World*; and yet almost in the next Line he says, That the Third Region of the Air is the *Habitation of his Seat*: As if in that Region, not above Forty or Fifty Miles from the Earth, the *Helm of the whole World* was fix'd, and the Supreme Throne of the Universe was no higher than the Air.

But I come now to Demonstrate, that in those Three Places where *Christ* is said to have *Ascended far above all Heavens*, and to have *passed through the Heavens*, and to be *made higher than the Heavens*; by the Supreme Heaven there, is by no means meant any part of the Air, but a vastly remoter Place in the Invisible World; and consequently, that Mr. *Whiston* has not answered, nor can answer, the Objection against frequent Ascensions of our Lord in the Forty Days, from the Immense Distance of the Heaven he ascended up to.

Christ ascended vastly higher than the Air, because he ascended to his Father, even to the Beatific Presence of God.

And the Argument is this; Our Lord's ascending into Heaven, is expressly said by himself to be ascending to his Father; *I leave the World, and go to the Father; I am not yet ascended to my Father; I ascend to my Father, and your Father.* In which last Words Mr. *Whiston* thinks our Lord spake of his ascending on the Morning of his Resurrection; and after that, as this Author Dreams, he descended in the Evening, and then went up again, and then returned to the World; and so there were frequent Ascents and Descents of our Saviour in the Forty Days. Now though he thought his Hypothesis of our Lord's ascending not above 40 or 50 Miles high, would serve for shewing the Possibility of our Lord's frequent ascending and descending in the Forty Days space; yet one thing he hath not

minded, which utterly ruins the vain Conceit,
 and that is, That our Lord ascended to his
 FATHER : This he did not think of at
 all. Surely if our Lord ascended no far-
 ther than the Third Region of the Air, a-
 bout 40 or 50 Miles high, he could not
 have come at his Father, or reach'd him :
 For is the *Glory of the Father*, is the *Throne*
of the Majesty in the Heavens; is the Beati-
 fic Presence of God, and the Paradise of
 the Blessed, in the higher part of the Air ?
 And again, as I have said before, is the
 Right Hand of God, to which our Savi-
 our ascended; is the *Right Hand of the Ma-*
jesty on high; is that Supreme Cœlestial Ma-
 jesty, I say, only a few Miles above us, in
 a place where the Devils reside ? Hath the
 Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, and of us
 all, his Dwelling with the Apostate Spi-
 rits ? When we say, *Our Father, which art*
in Heaven, do we mean in so saying, Our
 Father which art in the Air ? Would that
 be a good Exposition of the Invocation in
 the beginning of the Lord's Prayer ? *Glory*
 Luke 2. 14. *to God in the highest*, ἐν ὑψίστοις, was the An-
 gelical Doxology : There is a manifest Di-
 stinction in Scripture, between God's Om-
 nipresence, and his Special Presence ; God
 is every where, but not every where after
 the same manner, nor doth he make equal
 Expressions of his Presence every where.
 In those Words of *David*, *Whither shall I*

go from thy Spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy Presence? If I ascend up into Heaven, thou art there; If I make my Bed in Hell, behold thou art there; the Psalmist speaks simply of the Ubiquity and Imensity of the Spirit of God: And the Apostle told the Athenians, that God is not far from every one of us: But the Scripture speaks of a particular Presence of God, both in this World and the other, which is not every where.

As for Instance; God is especially present in Places separated for his Sacred Worship. Thus when the Tabernacle and Temple had been newly erected and finished, God filled the Rooms of both Structures with his Glory; and often the Glory of the Lord appeared in the Tabernacle of the Congregation; and where-ever his Saints are gathered together in his Name, he is still in the midst of them, though without any Visible Manifestations of his Glory. Then again, God is said to be present in a particular manner with Good Men, to take care of them, and to watch over them for good, as his peculiar Favourites. Thus we read that God was with Joseph, and Moses, and Joshua, and Gideon, and David, and with our Blessed Saviour himself.

But there is still another Presence of the Divine Majesty, which is the most Blessed

Psalm. 139.
7, 8.

Acts 17.
22.

Exod. 40.
34, 35.
1 Kings 8.
10, 11.
2 Chron.
5. 13, 14.

Matth. 18.
20.

Gen. 39.
2, 3, 21.
Josh. 1. 5.
Judg. 6. 12.
2 Sam. 5.
10.

John 8. 29.
Acts 10.
38.

Luke 1.
19.

of all : For we may observe that our Saviour distinguishes the Especial Presence of God with him *in the Days of his Flesh*, from another Especial Presence of God, to which he was going, *The Father which hath sent me, is with me*, John 8. 29. And yet he says, *I go to the Father*, Chap. 16. 28. And these two Special Presences of God are distinguished by God himself ; *Thus saith the*

Isa. 57. 15.

High and Lofty One that inhabiteth Eternity, whose Name is Holy, I dwell in the High and Holy Place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble Spirit. As likewise the Psalmist

Psal. 139.

7.
16. 11.

clearly distinguishes the Omnipresence of God, from his Beatific Presence, *Whither shall I flee from thy Presence ?* And yet he says, *In thy Presence is fulness of Joy.* God is every where present, but *Fulness of Joy* is not every where ; but only in that most Blessed Presence of God in the highest Heaven, which he tells us is the *Throne of his Majesty*, where at his *Right Hand there are Pleasures for evermore.*

Isa. 66. 1.
Psalm 16.
11.

Now to this most Glorious Presence of God in the Empyrean Heaven, our Lord Jesus Ascended ; there he appeared *in the Presence of God for us* : And therefore whereas our Lord is said to have ascended to his Father, and now to be sitting at his Father's Right Hand ; who can imagine that at his Ascension he went up no higher than that Sphere of the Air, which is supposed

Heb. 9.
24.

to
Ba
an
De
int
Pri
No
fied
Air
so l
sent
lyes
ple.
A
be
I m
to p
our
pear
is al
Disce
Foun
I con
little
and y
Piece
himse
which
Accom
World
Book
of it
to

to be the Habitation of Angels, Good and Bad ? For is the Throne of *the Father of an Infinite Majesty*, seated in a Region of Devils ? I may add, that *Christ's* Ascension into Heaven, was prefigured by the High-Priest's entering into the Holy of Holies. Now certainly the Holy of Holies signified the Highest Heaven, and therefore the Air doth not answer to the Holy of Holies ; so low a Sphere could not be fitly represented by the Uppermost Room, the Holiest of all in the Tabernacle and Temple.

Heb. 9. 7
12.

And now what cause has Mr. *Whiston* to be ashamed of his ridiculous Hypothesis ? I must profess to the World, that his Tract to prove frequent Ascents and Descents of our Saviour in the Forty Days, as it appears to me (for I can say no better of it) is all Whimsie and Foolery. In all this Discourse I can see nothing of that *solid Foundation* he speaks of, p. 286, 296. and I conceive I have utterly destroyed all the little appearance of Reasoning that is in it ; and yet This is the Esteemed and Beloved Piece on which he hath greatly valued himself : This is the Admirable Piece, which he could not forbear annexing to his *Accomplishment of the Prophecies* ; and the World must needs have it at the end of his Book, how foreign soever to the Subject of it, because it was his Darling : And this

His fond-
ness of the
Notion of
several As-
censions.

was

was the Curious Piece that deserved the Reprinting with Enlargement. For whereas the dull World would not buy his other Book, nor take the Impression off fast enough to occasion another Edition of his Piece of frequent Ascensions; he was resolved to give it a new Edition himself, for he inserted it amongst his *Sermons and Essays on several Subjects*.

Finally, This is the Rare and Wonderful Piece, which he thought he highly deserved to be doubly paid for by them that would have it; for he placed it between his Sermons and other Essays; that they who should have a mind to purchase that Book, might be obliged to buy his *Ascensions* again, though they had them already: But methinks it was not fair to make his Reader pay twice for such poor Stuff, as in my Mind was not worth one Farthing of any Man's Money at first.

This Opinion taken up by him but newly.

I shall remark one thing more; viz. That the Author hath been no great while of this Mind, That *Christ* ascended frequently; he has not long made this Worthy Discovery: Very probably his Hypothesis was as new and surprizing to himself but a little time before the Publication of his Eight Sermons, as it was to the World when his Book came out. This any one may observe, who will but see how he ends his *Harmony of the Four Evangelists*.

In St. *Mark's* History we have an Account only of one Ascension of *Christ*; In St. *Luke* Mr. *Whiston* says there is an Account of several Ascensions of *Christ*: And therefore if Mr. *Whiston*, when he wrote his *Harmony*, had believed about *Christ's* Ascending, as he has happened to believe since, doubtless he would not have omitted saying something to demonstrate the Harmony of the seemingly disagreeing Evangelists in this Particular; but without offering in the least to reconcile the two Evangelists in their History of *Christ's* Ascension, or taking any notice of several Ascensions of *Christ* after his Resurrection, he concludes his *Harmony Epitomiz'd* with

Harm. Epitomiz'd,
P. 543.

THE ASCENSION.

Nor is his *Arrianism* of any longer standing with him, as appears from the Doxology at the end of one of his Sermons, out of which he bids his Reader blot *Three Persons and One God*. O horrid ERRAT! to use his own Words: It seems the pretended Mistake was not the Error of the Press, nor of his Pen neither; but of his Mind and Opinion: He was Orthodox when he composed that Sermon, and when he preached it in the Year 1704. though not when he published it. For when he had sent it to the Press, he forgot that he had ended it with the Doxology that Sermons are usually concluded withal; and therefore

Likewise his Arrian Hypothesis as new,
P. 123.

when

when it was printed off, he would not suffer it to go into the World without that wretched *Dele*. And so we see that he has changed from the Belief of but one Ascension of *Christ*, to the Belief of several Ascensions, and from the Orthodox Faith to *Arrianism*, in a little time. And some may think that a pernicious Affectation of Singularity in Opinion, endangers this unsettled Gentleman yet farther, and is likely to betray him at length into other unhappy Turnings likewise; as from an *Arrian* to a *Socinian*, from a *Socinian* to a *Deist*, and from a *Deist* to an *Atheist*.

APPENDIX.

Brief Remarks upon one of Mr. Whiston's Notes in his Directions for the METHOD of the Study of Divinity : Or, A Short Dissertation concerning the Integrity and Purity of the Holy Scriptures.



IN his Advice about the Study of Divinity, there is a certain Paragraph, which I think may give great Offence, both to Jews and Christians; and for that Reason I thought fit to consider it by it self, and to make particular Reflections upon it: And because my Answer thereto would be too large a Digression from the chief Design of my Book, I therefore reserved it for an Appendix at last.

After

After stating the Canon of Scripture, and enlarging it, (for he adds *the Two Epistles of St. Clement, and the Constitutions of the Apostles by St. Clement, and the Pastor of Hermas*, to the Common Canon, and is in a fair way for taking in *Wisdom and Baruch* too; and so this Gentleman presumes to correct not only the Copies of Canonical Scripture, but even the very Canon it self) and after observing a different kind and degree of *Afflatus* or Inspiration, in the several Sorts and Parts of Scripture; *A Point*, he says, which hath *not been hitherto*, that he knows of, *touched upon by any Body*, but himself, who would be thought the Wonder of the Age for new Discoveries; next he proceeds to instruct his Student in Divinity, that he must not expect to find the Bible so perfect a Book as could be wish'd; for that our present Copies are something different from the Originals, and the Scripture hath suffered Corruption and Loss in the many Ages and Hands it hath passed through, before it hath come to us. *Note, (3.) That the Divinely inspir'd Books appear MOST PLAINLY to have been subject to the same Disorders of Copies, Mistakes of Transcribers, Losses of some Parts, and other the like Accidents, which are incident to all Ancient Writings whatsoever.*

This appears most plainly to be false; if there be such a thing as a Providence in the World, and if there be a Differencing Providence over Beings and Things, according to their different Natures, and as they are more or less worthy in Themselves; as most certainly there is. For Instance, There is a more particular Providence over Men than over Sparrows: And why? The Reason is, Because, as our Saviour tells us, *We are of more value than many Sparrows;* and there is a more particular Providence over Good Men than over Bad Men: *The Eye of the Lord is upon them that fear him.* The Reason is, because *the Righteous is more excellent than his Neighbour.*

In like manner, since there is no Comparison between *Divinely-Inspir'd Books*, and *Human Writings*, in Worth and Excellence; neither is there any Comparison in the Interest they have in the Divine Providence and Vigilance over them. Volumes, Precious and Divine, that Holy Men of old were mov'd and inspir'd by the Spirit of God to write them, must be supposed to have a Proportionate Care of the Providence of God to preserve them. Therefore the *Divinely Inspir'd Books* do appear most plainly not to have been subject to the same Disorders of Copies, Mistakes of Transcribers, &c. which are incident to all other Ancient Writings. It appears at the same time by un-

doubted Evidence, that those Disorders are not very great and numerous, that those Mistakes are comparatively not very many, nor, generally speaking, important.

So then there are great Disorders in our Copies, though not very great ones; some, though they are not numerous; the Mistakes are many, though comparatively they are not very many; of some Importance, though of little, generally speaking, and still to be corrected by Ancient Versions, as Mr. Whiston has corrected the beginning of the 72^d Psalm, by an Ancient Version that no Body knows of; or Comparison of Texts together in most Cases, as he has corrected 2 Sam. 7. 14. by Psalm 89. And those Losses are few, and very rarely of any Books or Passages of GREAT CONSEQUENCE to us. Some Losses then it seems we must be content with, though they are few; and some Books and Passages of Great Consequence to us, are gone, though such Losses have happened but very rarely: So that notwithstanding all these Occasional Defects or Errors, They in the main have come very entire and compleat down to these last Ages, and so abundantly to afford us, all necessary Guidance and Instruction, both as to Faith and Practice in order to our Eternal Salvation.

It is some Comfort however after all that still he grants the Holy Scriptures in the main to have come down to us

entire
affo
both
Ete
som
shou
dow
wer
of G
the
sequ
are
us,
Guid
Prac
I kno
Scho
I hav
even
Chris
it is
fearle
But f
ment
Men a
in the
usal o
of An
past D
the ot
the Ef
if not
entire

entire and compleat, and so as abundantly to afford us all necessary Guidance and Instruction, both as to Faith and Practice, in order to our Eternal Salvation: Only there seems to be some Repugnancy in what he says; For how should the Holy Scriptures in the main come down very entire and compleat, supposing there were any Losses at all of Books or Passages of Great Consequence to us? Or how could the Loss of any Scripture be of Great Consequence to us, if in those Scriptures that are left us, and which we have still with us, we are abundantly afforded all necessary Guidance and Instruction, both as to Faith and Practice, in order to our Eternal Salvation? I know the vulgar sort of Christians, and of Scholars too, are very fearful of allowing what I have here done; and well they may, and even those too that are not the vulgar sort of Christians and Scholars, as he calls them: And it is a shame for him, that he is so very fearless in allowing what he hath here done. But since these have no manner of real Argument of their side; since all truly Learned Men agree herein, as may be seen every where in their Writings; and since the careful perusal of the Copies, Versions, and Monuments of Ancient Times cannot but put this Matter past Dispute with all Impartial Men, I can call the other Opinion by no better a Name, than the Effect of either Ignorance or Superstition, if not of both together.

Here he takes things for granted, not easily to be granted him; and from thence concludes, That they who differ from him are either Ignorant or Superstitious, if not both together; *These have no manner of real Argument of their side.* Yes, as I have shewn, they have a real Argument on their side; and a far better Argument it is, than he has on his side, viz. The Care of a Particular Providence guarding and securing the Divine Books. ALL truly Learned Men agree herein, as may be seen EVERY WHERE in their Writings. So then amongst those that are accounted Men of Learning, they that are of Mr. Whiston's Mind about the Holy Scriptures, are truly Learned Men, and none but they. But Dr. Du Pin, I think, passes with Mr. Whiston for a truly Learned Man: For thrice is he named amongst the Authors in the Catalogue of Books, or Theological Library, which Mr. Whiston recommends to Students in Divinity.

Advice for the Study of Divinity, p. 322, 325, 326.

And yet Dr. Du Pin is not over-forward to believe that the Church hath lost any Part of God's Book; as may be seen in his Preliminary Dissertation about the Authors of the Bible. The careful Perusal of the Copies, Versions, and Monuments of Ancient Times, cannot but put this Matter past Dispute with all Impartial Men. I much question whether Mr. Whiston hath carefully perused those Copies, Versions, and Monuments of Ancient Times he speaks

speaks of ; If he has not, then he talks at Random, *understanding neither what he says, nor whereof he affirms.* But perhaps he relies altogether on the Judgment and Honesty of some of his *truly Learned Men*, who, he thinks, have carefully perused them : And must the careful Perusal of the Copies, Versions and Monuments of Ancient Times, put this matter past Dispute with all Impartial Men ? viz. That there have been Losses of Books and Passages of Great Consequence to us, though very rarely ? How can that be ? For, if upon a careful Perusal of the Copies, Versions, and Monuments of Ancient Times, it be found that some Scriptures are not in our Copies, which are in the Ancient Copies and Versions, then those Scriptures are not lost, because they are there ; and all the while both Jews and Christians, must be supposed to have been exceedingly to blame for their Neglect, in having never yet corrected and perfected Later Copies by the Ancient Ones. But, if upon a due perusing and comparing the most Ancient Copies and Versions that we can come at, they be found the very same with our present Copies, then why doth this Man talk of Imaginary Corruptions and Losses, which he can never prove ? He hath not proved, that there are any such *Occasional Defects or Errors* : I have proved it highly reasonable to suppose, that there neither

have been, nor could be any. And since none of these things are so, as he says, I can call his Opinion by no better a Name, than the Effect of either Ignorance or Impiety, if not of both together.

But the strangest thing comes last; And I esteem the other Opinion one of the Grand Hindrances of the free and unbiass'd Enquiries of Men into the true State and Meaning of these Sacred Oracles of God. This is hardly Intelligible, and it must be a difficult Business to make Sense of it: For how the Opinion, that the Bible, our Sacred Book of Divinity, is a True, Entire, and Perfect Collection of all the Divinely-Inspired Writings that ever were, without any Corruption or Loss; how this Opinion of the Bible, I say, should be one of the Grand Hindrances or Prejudices to the Study of the Bible, or the contrary Opinion any Help to that Study, I cannot imagine. Nay, supposing that were really true which he would make us believe, to wit, That the Holy Scriptures have been something corrupted and diminished in their coming down to us, I do not see the Wisdom of his making this Observation in his Advice for the Study of Divinity. I marvel why he should bring in this Note among the rest, while he was giving Advice for that Study: For certainly the meaner Opinion we have of the Bible, still we are the less disposed to look

into

into it, and to study the Divinity that is in it; and therefore such an Advertisement could not be proper *Advice for the Study of Divinity*, which must tend to dishearten Men from ever studying it at all.

Whereas Mr. *Whiston* would have it believed, That there have been some few *Losses of Books or Passages of Scripture*, and even of *Great Consequence to us*, but very rarely; Either it is his Opinion, That it was impossible it should be otherwise, considering the *State of the Holy Books under the Judges, Manasseh, the Babylonish Captivity, and the Prophanation by Antiochus Epiphanes*, and the many Ages and Hands the Scripture hath passed through, before it has come to us; and he is sure that some Books or Passages must be gone, though he could not instance in any particularly: Or else he thinks that there are plain Instances of Parts of Scripture that are missing, and he is able to shew that Losses there have been, and of what Books in particular. If he means the former, then in Answer to the pretended Impossibility, that the Books of Scripture should hold entire and uncorrupt throughout so many Ages of the World, I still insist upon a Special and most Vigilant Providence, that hath constantly secured and preserved them all along, and handed them safely down to us: And I utterly deny, That *the Divinely-Inspired Books have*

been subject to the same Disorders of Copies, Mistakes of Transcribers, Loss of some Parts, and other the like Accidents, which are incident to all Ancient Writings whatsoever.

If the latter be his Meaning, (and truly I think he means both) then I am to consider the Particular Books and Writings which he may reckon to be lost, Parts of Scripture: And I suppose he must chiefly mean those Books cited in the Canon, that are not extant; of which there are Four Sorts; Some are barely Historical Titles, but no Names of the Authors that wrote them: Others of them were written by Persons expressly named, who were Prophets: Others by their Titles contained Divine Revelations: Others were Books of Revelations, taken down in Writing by God's Special Order and Command. And now let us see whether we have reason to conclude, that any of these Books were as Divine as those in the Canon.

Of the First Sort are *the Book of the Wars of the Lord*, Numb. 21. 14. and *the Book of Jathar*, or the Upright, Joshua 10. 13. 2 Sam. 1. 18. and * *the Book of the Kings of Israel*, which is mentioned 2 Chron.

33. 18.
* This Book was not either of the Two Books of the Kings in the Canon, since there is nothing of Manasse's Repentance and Prayer in 2 Kings 21. (unless we can suppose that part of the Chapter concerning Manasse was lost, or that the Transcribers left it out) but it was either the

33. 18. For the Authors of these Books are Nameless. And surely we need not be very forward to esteem such Books Divinely-Inspired, concerning which we cannot make any certain Judgment from the Persons that wrote them, because they are not known.

Other Books quoted in Scripture, that are lost, have their Authors named; and such are *Nathan's Book*, and *Gad's* and *Shemaiah's*, and *Iddo's* and *Jehoiada's*; and I may

add the Book, entituled, *The Sayings of the Seers*. And were not such Books inspired,

which had inspired Men for their Authors, and were written by Prophets? I answer,

We cannot well think that all the Books of Prophets have been written by Divine In-

spiration; nor can we reasonably suppose that Prophetical Men of old were inspired

in every thing they thought, spake or wrote. We read that *Solomon spake*

Three Thousand Proverbs, and that *his Songs*

1 Chron.

29. 29.

2 Chron. 9.

29.

& 12. 15.

& 13. 22.

& 20. 34.

& 33. 19.

1 Kings 4.

32.

the very Book of *the Sayings of the Seers*, in which *Manasseh's* Prayer was recorded; for it seems that Book contained some Historical Account of the Kings; or rather, as

some think, it was a Third Book of *Kings*, another History of them, that was Apocryphal, and never inserted in

the Canon. And it seems the more likely to have been an Apocryphal Piece, because it is entituled, *The Book of the Kings of Israel*: For no where else, in all the Second

Book of the *Chronicles*, is it said, That the remaining History of any of the Kings of *Judah* was written in the

Book of the Kings of *Israel* only; but either in the Book of the Kings in the general, 2 Chron. 24. 27. or in the Book of the Kings both of *Judah* and *Israel*, 2 Chron. 16. 11. &

5. 26. & 27. 7. & 28. 26. & 32. 32. & 35. 27. & 36. 8.

were

were a Thousand and Five ; and some of his Proverbs, and one of his Songs, are in the Canon : But it doth not follow therefore, that all the Proverbs and Songs he uttered were dictated by the Spirit. The Divinely-Inspired had their proper Seasons of Inspiration, and their particular Subjects upon which they were inspired, and their different Services allotted them, according to the Wisdom and Good Pleasure of God. Some of them were inspired by the Holy Ghost, to deliver the Divine Will and Message only by Word of Mouth : Others were inspired only to commit Divine Doctrines to Writing : Others to be Sacred Historians for recording Facts and Providences : Others for all these Purposes. And the same Persons, who at certain Times, and upon special Occasions, were Pen-men of Revelations, by the Direction and Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, might at other times be Authors, when their Books were only from themselves, and no more than Human Works.

Thus in the Conclusion of *Uzziah's Story*, 2 Chron. 26. 22. a Book written by *Isaiah* is referr'd to. Now the rest of the Acts of *Uzziah* first and last, did *Isaiah* the Prophet, the Son of *Amoz*, write. Where we read of no Acts of King *Uzziah*, in the Vision of *Isaiah* : Therefore, besides his Inspired Prophecy in the Canon, he wrote a History

History of *Uzziah*, and of other Kings of *Judah*; and that Book of *Isaiab*, though written by a Prophet, might not be Inspired.

But other Books that are lost are not only ascribed to Holy Men who had sometimes Revelations from God; but, as appears by their Titles, did also themselves contain Divine Revelations; viz. The Books entitled, *The Prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite*, and *the Visions of Iddo the Seer against Jeroboam the Son of Nebat*, 2 Chron. 9. 29. and the *Ἀποκάλυψις Ἐνώχ*, *Enoch's Book of Prophecy*, cited by St. *Jude* in the 14th Verse of his Epistle. And is it certain that all Divine Inspirations have been committed to Writing? Or shall we say that all that have been written, were Penn'd by the Divine Motion? It seems not likely, that what the *Seventy Elders*, *Eldad* and *Medad* in particular, and what *Saul's Messengers* first, and then himself, uttered in their Prophecies, when the Spirit of the Lord came upon themselves, was ever upon Record: And if some Divine Revelations were never recorded at all, then others of them that were written, might not be Penn'd by the Direction and Inspiration of the Holy Ghost; For Historical Accounts of Divine Inspiration might be given in Books, which were not Divinely inspired themselves. Thus some *Rabbins* of old, and some Fathers of

Numb.
11. 25, 26.
1 Sam. 19.
20, 21, 22,
23, 24.

of the Christian Church, have cited the Book of *Enoch* in distinction from the Sacred Canon; even though it was called *Ἀποκάλυψις*, a Book of Revelation and Prophecy.

Jerem. 36. Lastly: Other Writings that are lost, are Books of Revelations that were Penn'd down at God's express Command; and they were the Two Rolls that were written by *Baruch* the Scribe, from the Mouth of the Prophet *Jeremiah*. For when *Jehudi* had begun to read the first Roll before King *Jehoiakim*, the King cut it with a Penknife, and cast it into the Fire, and it was consumed: And though thereupon the same Words, with some Enlargements, were written in another Roll from the Mouth of the same Prophet, at the Command of God, yet neither have we that Roll.

To this I say, That the Rolls written from the Mouth of *Jeremiah*, contained his Prophecy, beginning at the 3d. Verse of the 25th Chapter: So that we have the Scripture of that Prophecy, though not the Rolls wherein it was written particularly for King *Jehoiakim's* use, and for his Court and People.

I answer farther, That the Rolls written by *Baruch* the Scribe, were not Inspired Writings: They contained indeed the Revelations of an Inspired Prophet, but were not written by Inspiration themselves: For

th
Wr
live
for
for
The
tion
cure
Tra
ry
led;
an I
was
Form
was
come
en f
W
s no
Whist
ings,
have
certai
ot be
ooks
Quota
ity c
Quest
Quoti
By
not

there is no need at all of Inspiration for Writing from a Man's Mouth what he delivers, any more than there is need of it for Copying out what one sees written, or for Transcribing from a Book or Paper. There was no need of an Internal Inspiration, besides an External Providence, to secure their Writings truly and exactly, who Transcribed the Sacred Originals. In every Scripture Two Things must be supposed; viz. A Divine Motion to Write, and an Inspiration in the Writing: The Latter was never without the Former, but the Former might be without the Latter; as it was in the Case of the Rolls, wherein God commanded that Prophecies should be written from *Jeremiah's* Mouth.

Wherefore, all things considered, There is no apparent Necessity of yielding to Mr. *Whiston*, That any Divinely-Inspired Writings, such as we call *The Holy Scriptures*, have ever been lost or destroyed. This is certain, That as on the one Hand it was not beneath the Inspired Writers to Quote Books that were Apocryphal, and such Quotations could not justly make the Divinity of their own Writings to be called in Question; so on the other Hand, their bare Quoting of Books did not prove the * Di-

* By the way; If even Inspired Mens Citations of Books be not a sufficient Proof, that the Books themselves they quoted

vine Authority of the Books they quoted, as I observed in my *Preface*.

No doubt there were Annals and Records in the Jewish Church, besides the Scripture; and these were sometimes made use of distinctly from the Scripture, and Passages were quoted from them that are not in the Sacred History; and we may well believe that from such Ancient Monuments St. Stephen, and St. Paul, and St. Jude, cited Particulars of Antiquity, not to be found in the Old Testament: For from thence probably St. Stephen learn'd Moses's Age, when he went to visit his Brethren; to wit, that he was then full Forty Years old, Acts 7. 23. and St. Paul took the Names of the Two Magicians that withstood Moses, who were Jannes and Jambres, 2 Tim. 3. 8. and

quoted were Inspired; Much less are a few Citations out of the *Apocrypha* that are found in the Fathers, any Proof that the Books so called ought to be received for Scripture. And yet this is one of the Reasons upon which the Council of Trent proceeded, when they Canonized *Apocryphal* Books, which were never received by the Jews for Canonical; as Pope Clement the Eighth, Editor of Sixtus Quintus's Bible with Corrections, tells us in his Preface to the Prayer of Manasse; *Oratio Manasse, nec non Libri Duo, qui sub Tertii & Quarti Esdra nomine Circumferuntur hoc in loco, extra scilicet seriem Canonice Librorum, qui sancta Tridentina Synodus suscepit, & pro Canonicis suscipiendos decrevit, sepositi sunt, ne prorsus interirent, quippe qui nonnullis sanctis Patribus interdum citantur, & in aliquibus Bibliis Latinis tam Manuscriptis, quam Impressis reperiantur.*

St.
ten
and
ses
and
put
the
the
out

*
tione
either
else
Paul
and I
the A
any c
was a
the R
For h
Him
fore f
Christ
to eva

† S
the D
was p
Brink,
shoul
had hi
do sup
after h
and bu
tended
have h

St.

St. * *Jude* had the Knowledge of the Contention between *Michael* the Arch-Angel and the Devil, concerning the Body of *Moses*; *Jude*, v. 9. if indeed it was really and † properly *Moses's* Body that the Dispute was about.

It is true, The Books that are lost, and the Canonical Books, are mentioned together in Scripture, and mingled there without any Marks of Distinction. We are re-

ferr'd

* If the Three Holy Men had not the Particulars mentioned from Ancient Writings extant in their Times, then either they received these things from Oral Tradition, or else they knew them by Immediate Inspiration; Just as St. *Paul's* Gospel, that is, the Account he gives of the Life and Death, and Resurrection of *Christ*, after his Call to the Apostleship, when as yet he had not conferred with any other of the Apostles, or come near any one of them; was all an Inspired History, Immediately and Only from the Revelation of *Jesus Christ*, Gal. 1. 11, 12, 16, 17, 18. For his Gospel, which he delivered, he received of the Lord Himself, 1 Cor. 11. 23. and 15. 3. not from Man. Therefore says he to *Timothy*, 2 Tim. 2. 8. Remember that *Jesus Christ* of the Seed of *David*, was raised from the Dead, *according to MY Gospel*.

† Some think that the Controversy between *Michael* and the Devil, was about the Infant Body of *Moses*, when it was put into an Ark of Bulrushes, and laid by a River's Brink, Exod. 2. as that *Michael* declared the Babe's Life should be saved, but the Devil on the contrary would have had him cast into the River, and drown'd. Others rather do suppose, that the Dispute was about *Moses's* dead Body after his Decease, Deut. 34. 6. *Michael* was for hiding it, and burying it privately out of the way. The Devil contended for a Publick Burial of *Moses's* Body, and would have had the Place of his Interment known, that it might
occur.

ferr'd to the Books of *Nathan*, and *Shemaiah*, and *Jehu*, &c. as well as to the Books of the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah* in the Canon, without any Difference put between the former and the latter Books : For the Divine Writings do not usually bear Witness of themselves, to distinguish them from Writings that are but the Works of Men ; of which we have one Remarkable Instance in the Canon of the New Testament, viz. in the 8th Chapter of *St. John* : For the Beginning of that Chapter many have taken for Apocryphal, though there be not the least Note of Distinction in the Chapter itself, dividing the Apocryphal Part from the Certain Canonical Text, and directing

occasion Idolatry. And these Expositors do conceive, that *St. Jude* took this Passage of the Quarrel between *Michael* and the Devil, from a certain Apocryphal Book now lost, which was called *'Avdān-Is*, The Assumption of *Moses*. But others are of Opinion, that *St. Jude* referr'd to *Zech* 3. 1, 2. And so, by *Moses's* Body the Good and the Evil Angel contended about, they understand not his Natural, but his Political Body ; viz. the Body of the Jewish Church and Nation, of which *Moses* was the Great Head and Legislator ; as the Christian Church, of which *Christ* is the Head, is called *the Body of Christ*. *Michael* was zealous for having the Body of the Captive Jews restored to *Jerusalem* their old Seat, and their Temple rebuilt there ; The Devil laid grievous things to the Charge of the High Priest and People, and accused Both, as unworthy of a Restoration. And if the last of the Three Expositors be in the right, then the Passage of the Controversy between *Michael* and the Devil, *St. Jude* had not from any Old Apocryphal Writing, or from Tradition, or Immediate Inspiration, but from Scripture.

where

If any One should say, Why may we not suppose, That there have been Two Sorts of Scriptures ; Some that were meant in the Design of God, to be only for a Temporary Use, which therefore at length were lost, and might be spared ; and Others that were intended to continue, and to be standing Instructions to the World ? I would answer, That St. Paul knew no such Distinction of Scriptures, but tells us plainly, *Ὅσα περὶ ἡμᾶς*, *Whatever things were written aforetime*, that is, Divinely written, *εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν περὶ ἡμᾶς*, *were written for our Learning*, who are at so vast a distance from the time when they were first written : And if God hath caused all Holy Scriptures to be written for our Learning, and for theirs that come after us, then never were there any Scriptures which in the Divine Intention were meant to be of use only for a while ; for such Scriptures could not be written that we should be Learners from them, which are supposed to be lost, and were never intended to come down to us. So then, according to the Apostle, one thing Essential to a Scripture and that enters into the Notion of it, is its certain Conti-

Rom. 15.

A a

nuance

nuance in all Ages ; Which therefore I may justly define thus ; A SCRIPTURE is a Divine Writing, Penn'd by the Motion and Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, for Perpetual Use in the Church of God. And this Definition of a Scripture seems to agree well with the Apostle's Notion of it elsewhere ; to wit, in 2 Tim. 3. 16. For there he says, Πᾶσα γραφή, θεόπνευτος καὶ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, πρὸς ἑλεγχόν, &c. All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, &c. The Apostle does not say, Πᾶσα γραφή νῦν ἔσται, θεόπνευτος, &c. All Scripture that is now extant, and which we have, is given by Inspiration of God, &c. as if there had been a Scripture which is gone, and we have not ; but he says, Πᾶσα γραφή, θεόπνευτος καὶ ὠφέλιμος, All Scripture Inspired of God, and Profitable : That is, he speaks of all Scripture whatsoever in the most General Notion of it ; telling us, That there are Two Things most Essential to it, and they are Divine Inspiration and Usefulness ; it is θεόπνευτος καὶ ὠφέλιμος. Nor does the Apostle say Πᾶσα ἡ γραφή, with the Article, Every Particular Scripture is profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, for Instruction in Righteousness : For every Part of Scripture, every Chapter or Verse there, is not Profitable for all these Purposes together. But he says, Πᾶσα γραφή, that is, All Scripture

col.

collectively taken for the whole, All that ever was written, is in some part of it Profitable *for Doctrine*, in another Part *for Reproof*, in another *for Correction*, in another *for Instruction in Righteousness*. And therefore, if All Scripture be Profitable for *the Man of God* in these several Respects; it follows, that All Scripture in the very Nature of the Thing, is a Standing Revelation; and its perpetual Continuance and Preservation must be supposed, and consequently no Scripture hath been lost: For Scripture that is lost, is no longer Profitable, nor can it be of any Use to us, unless the Particulars contain'd in a lost Scripture, be remembred and conveyed down by Tradition.

Those Divine Revelations, of which there was no more than an Oral Delivery by Prophets, have been indeed to serve a present Purpose, and were meant to be of use only for a while; but Writings Divinely-Inspired, and Divine Records in Holy Books, were of another Nature: They, I say, were meant to be fix'd and abiding Things to the World's End. For did God ever Move and Inspire a Man to commit his Will and Word to Writing with a Foresight, that unless his Divine Power and Providence effectually interpos'd, that Inspired Writing would certainly be lost? And did he cause that Scripture to be *written for our Learning*, with an

Intention nevertheless to suffer it in the Event to be lost : That could never readily enter into my Mind, and they that can think so, let 'em : But for my Part, it must be shewn me very plainly to be True in Fact, That a Writing of that Sort hath been ever quite Extinguish'd, before I can believe any such thing. Till therefore I meet with most clear and convincing Evidence, that Mr. *Whiston* is in the right about Losses of Scripture; I shall go on to argue, That doubtless the forementioned Books were not Scripture, because they are lost, rather than that Much Scripture has been lost, because they are not to be found : And still I must conclude, that those Books were no more the Works of a Divine Inspiration, than the Objects of a Special Providence.

And then I am the more disposed to be of the Mind, That we have All the Scriptures, as they were given by Inspiration at first, because the other Opinion is of dangerous Consequence. One of the Arguments Dr. *Du Pin* uses against supposing That the several Books quoted in Scripture which are lost, were Scriptures themselves is this, *We must otherwise*, says he, *be oblig'd to say, That the Church has lost a Great Part of the Book of God*; Which to the *Truly Learned Man* would sound but ill, as needs must, because of the Pernicious Tendency of that Principle to incline Men to

*Preliminary
Dissertation
about the
Authors of
the Bible,
Sect. 2.*

Dei

Deism. To allow a Divine Authority to Books that are lost, equal to that of the Canon, may endanger and shake the Authority of the Books we have : For let Mr. *Whiston* say what he pleases, some People will not be very apt to persuade themselves, That ever the Spirit of God was concern'd in Indicting of Books, which his Providence was no way concern'd to preserve when written. And therefore to talk of Writings that are lost, which were no less Inspired than the Scriptures we have, is enough to occasion Scoffers to infer with Triumph, that Neither were Inspired at all.

And how much of God's Book may be lost from us, if once we admit that any one Part of it is lost ? Mr. *Whiston* indeed nothing to his Student in Divinity, That the *Divinely-Inspired Books appear most plainly to have been subject to the same Disorders of Copies, Mistakes of Transcribers, LOSS OF SOME PARTS, and other the like Accidents, which are incident to all Ancient Writings whatsoever,* sees fit to tell him withal, That it appears at the same time, by undoubted Evidence, that the Losses of any Divinely-Inspir'd Books are few, and very rarely are there Losses of any Books or Passages of great Consequence to us. But alas ! This is *gratis dictum* : For how can it appear to Mr. *Whiston*, or to any Body else, by undoubted Evidence, That if Losses of Scripture there

A a 3

have

have been, those Losses have been few and rare? The Books quoted in Scripture which are lost, are many, and divers more Books may be lost of the same Sort, which there was no occasion for quoting in Scripture at all: So that if we set aside the Vigilance of a Particular Providence, for the Preservation of the Sacred Books, and once quit the main Argument that proves their safe Conveyance to us; why truly, for ought we know, so many of them may have perish'd one after another in the Ages of the World, as would, had they been Preserv'd and Collected, have been enough to make a Volume equal to our Bible; and God's Church may have lost as much Scripture as She retains.

I shall need to add but One Argument more to shew, That the Holy Scriptures, which (God be Praised) we Enjoy, are *Whole* and *Undefiled*; and it is this. Amongst the National Judgments and Calamities which were Denounc'd against the *Israelites*, in case they Apostatiz'd from God, and were Disobedient to his Laws, it is not once threat'ned to them, as what should be part of their Punishment, That the Precious Inspired Records of those Revealed Truths they had, should be destroyed or diminished, or that the Light of the Divine Law and Testimony should be extinguished or lessened amongst them; Nor alter the

De-

Destruction of the Temple and City of *Jerusalem* by the *Babylonians*, and the following Captivity to *Babylon*, was it any Part of the Description of the Miseries of the *Jews* in that Destruction and Exile, that thereby they lost all, or any of the Divine Oracles, that had been *Committed* to them. But from the New Testament we may be assured of the contrary ; For, as was noted in the *Preface*, our Saviour's Exhortation to *search the Scriptures*, and the *Bereans* being Commended for having done so, I think, can imply no less than that *Christ* and his Apostles found the Oracles of God Entire and Uncorrupt, in the Hands of the *Jews*.

And of all the Books and Passages pretended to be lost, To be sure Prophecies of the *Messias* were Scriptures too important to be of that Number ; I am most averse from believing, that ever any One such Prophecy was given forth, and Recorded, that is now wanting in the Canon of the Old Testament : So far am I from thinking with Mr. *Whiston*, that the Prediction in particular, That *Jesus* should be called a *Nazarene*, was an old Prophecy either utterly lost, or false *Transcrib'd* in our present Copies.

But now after all, Were that most True which is one of the things Mr. *Whiston* in his Two last Books contends for, but is no way necessary to be assented to, *viz.* That some Scriptural Books and Passages have

been lost ; for once let it be supposed that *All truly Learned Men* agree with him here as Unanimously as he tells us they do ; and what if Losses of Scripture, which I see none of, were as Evident and Certain, as he pretends they are ; still we have the Testimony of an Inspired Apostle concerning the Old Testament, That the Books of the Canon we have there, are very sufficient for us, and no more were needful : For St. Paul expressly told *Timothy*, That the HOLY SCRIPTURES were ABLE to make him WISE UNTO SALVATION, through Faith which is in Christ Jesus.

2 Tim. 3.
15.

And so likewise Mr. *Whiston* himself, who tells us there are some Disorders and Mistakes in the Divine Writings ; nay, speaks of a few Losses of Books or Passages of great Consequence to us ; even he, I say, vouchsafes to Grant, That notwithstanding such Occasional Defects or Errors, the Holy Scriptures in the main have come very entire and compleat down to these last Ages ; and so, abundantly to afford us all necessary Guidance and Instruction, both as to Faith and Practice, in order to our Eternal Salvation.

THE

of m
And
that
way
Brief
Holy
they
lectic
dy o
very
this
Who
Boo

THE CONCLUSION.



THUS have I finished my Animadversions on Mr. *Whiston's* Two New Doctrines in his late Book, viz. On his Doctrines of but One Sense in all the Prophecies of *Christ*; and of more Ascensions of *Christ*, than One. And there are several other gross Errors in that Book, which I have confuted by the way: And I thought good to annex a Brief Vindication of the Integrity of the Holy Scriptures; viz. To maintain, That they are a Full, Perfect, and Compleat Collection of Divine Writings, An Entire Body of the Inspir'd Divinity, against some very Indiscreet and Untoward Passages in this Author to the contrary: And upon the Whole, especially having compared his said Book with his last Book of *Essays*, and with other

other of his Pieces, I cannot but look upon him to be One of the most careless, rash, and injudicious Writers that have appeared in this Age. For it is evident to me, and I think it must be so to any one else who duly examines his Writings, that he is not a Man endued with a Sufficient Stock of Judgment, nor has he a Competent Clearness of Head to be Qualified for an Author; and yet notwithstanding, so unhappy is he, that he loves to be Scribbling, and still he will go on to trouble the World with strange Discourses, which surely few, if any, can advise him to Publish: And so his Observation, That *those who know little, are forward enough to publish that little they pretend to know*, is too true of him. I say, as it appears to me, There is much wanting in this poor Gentleman, a Neg^s for feeling truly the Force or Weakness of Arguments, so as he ought, and for an accurate distinguishing between Truth and Error: And therefore the more he writes, the more he must needs expose himself, and discover his Inability for Writing. And yet all the while, so very wise is he in his own Conceit, that he esteems himself Half-Inspired, and a kind of Prophet rais'd up in this Age for Special Purposes and Services, viz. To review and mend the Canon of Scripture, To correct Disorders there, To set Men right in their Notions of the Trinity

*Advice for
the Study
of Divini-
ty, p. 315.*

*Advice for
the Study
of Divini-
ty, p. 296.*

nity and Incarnation, To Proclaim the Approach of the Glorious State of the Church, and, in Preparation for so Blessed a Time, to remove some Vulgar Errors out of the way, and to make Discoveries of Important Truths, proper and needful to be known before the opening of that Scene, and to Instruct the World in all Material Points.

Now certainly never was Man more mistaken in himself, that set up to be Somebody in this kind : For, God knows, he is not *sufficient for these things*. And though, as appears plainly, he is not Gifted for Divinity, yet nevertheless he fancies, that he so far excels in it, as to be Able to give *Advice for the Study* of it ; whereas it had been better for him, if he had kept to his *Mathe-*
maticks, and have let Divinity alone.

An Able and Judicious Divine is known to be what he is, by nothing more than by Sound and Solid Interpretations of the Oracles of God : But Mr. *Whiston* in his Theological Discourses, hath notoriously fail'd of shewing his Skill that way ; as may appear from the List of Scriptures perverted by him, which I have given in the Contents. It is true, he speaks of Modern Commentators with the utmost Scorn, as if in understanding Scripture none of 'em were fit to be nam'd with him ; and yet he himself, as I have observed, is a very sorry
Exposi-

Advice,
p. 315.

Expositor ; what lamentable Work doth he make with divers Texts of Scriptures, which he takes in hand to explain : He advises his Student to avoid *rash and ill-grounded Interpretations* of the Holy Scripture, of which hardly any are more guilty than himself : And a great Reason of his so frequently miscarrying in Expounding Scripture, is this ; The Advice he gives for the Study of Divinity in his 8th Note, p. 306. he has followed too much himself : For not minding *Notes and Commentaries* much, he has gone upon his *own Strength*, and unwisely refused or neglected to call in Foreign Help to be advised by, though he has little Judgment or Strength of his own.

In his Book which I have Answered, there are divers Prophecies, and other Scriptures, which he hath grossly wrested from their true and genuine Sense ; and there are absurd Quotations and Interpretations of Texts in his *Several Ascensions of Christ*, reprinted and enlarged, as I have likewise shewn.

* *Essay on the Revelation of St. John,*
p. 303.

† *Dr. A-
lix's Exa-
mination of
several
Scripture-
Prophecies,*
&c.

In his * Collection of Scripture-Prophecies, relating, as he says, to the Times after the Coming of the **Messias**, and to several Passages and Events in those Times, there is not one † quarter of those Scriptures he has put together, which do any way concern those Matters.

There

There are Mistakes, and very great ones too, in his Explication of the 24th Chapter of *St. Matthew*, and the *Parallel Chapters* in *St. Mark* and *St. Luke*, concerning the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, and the Day of Judgment; wherein yet he vainly conceives that he has outdone all Expositors before him.

Essay on the Revelation,
p. 290.

But of all his faulty Interpretations of the Holy Oracles, what is most grievous to me, is his pretending to prove from the New Testament, That the Holy Apostles looked for the Day of Judgment to come in their Age; or at least, that *Christ* and his Apostles did not know but the End of the World might be then near at hand, and were inclinable to believe it was: For this little better than *Blasphemous Conceit*, as Mr. *Mede* well calls it, our Author has grounded upon Scriptures carelessly heaped together by him, which he has wretchedly perverted and abused; and in quoting of which for so miserable a Purpose, he has neither shewn the Divine nor the Scholar.

Essay on the Revelation, p. 130, 131, 132, &c.

The Works of Joseph Mede,
Book 3.
p. 665.

And he is no better a Judge of the Sense of Fathers, than an Interpreter of Scripture: Let any Man but mind the Passage he has quoted from *Irenæus*, against Double Senses in Prophecy, and then let him tell me, whether he thinks Mr. *Whiston* understands an Author; or, if that may be allowed him, whether he quotes fairly. And let any one consider well his Quotation from

*Reason and
Philosophy,
no Enemies
to Faith,
p. 215.*

from St. *Barnabas*, and his pretended Authority from St. *Jerome*; and then let him tell me likewise his Opinion of Mr. *Whiston*, whether he be not a Writer that quotes ignorantly, and at Random. Twice to appeal to the Fathers in that Book about certain Points, with no more than Three Quotations, and to be wrong in every one of them, is a shrewd Sign that Mr. *Whiston* has no Skill in Judging from Antiquity; or no Sincerity in Citing Testimonies, and consequently his Quotations are by no means to be relyed on. And therefore whereas he has given out, that he is to publish a Book *shortly*, wherein, from Testimonies of the Ancients, he *shall demonstrate beyond Contradiction*, That *Arrianism* and * *Apollinarianism* are Orthodox Divinity; that is, That *Christ* is neither *Perfect God, nor Perfect Man*, we may well prejudge what a sort of Book, such a Collection of Testimonies of his putting forth, is likely to be, and how miserably obnoxious he will render himself, if

* This is plainly the Scriptural and Primitive Notion of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, That the *Logos*, or Divine Nature of our Lord, condescended to become an Human, or, more properly, a Divine Soul in an Human Body, and thereby was truly a God Incarnate, and therein most properly suffered for us. *Reason and Philosophy, &c.* p. 216, 217. An Heresy condemned in the Synod of *Alexandria*, and in the Second Oecumenical Council of *Constantinople*. And yet Mr. *Whiston* says, That this he *shall shortly* fully prove by the Original Testimonies themselves. *Reason and Philosophy, &c.* p. 217.

he

he ventures a Piece of that Nature into the Hands of the Learned.

O! But the Reason why he hath not yet prepared his Book of Testimonies for the Publick, is, because he stays to receive the Judgment and Correction of the Learned, to whom it has been communicated in MS. That

*Preface to
the Ser-
mons and
Essays,
P. 1.*

pleases me well, and I am glad of it: For if he holds sincerely to his Purpose, first to have the Judgment and Corrections of the Learned, before he prepares his Book for the Publick; I am pretty well assured his Book will never come out at all, any more than his Accomplishment, and Ascensions, and other of his Essays, had ever seen the Light, if he had communicated his MSS. to the Learned, and had not relied on his own single Strength.

But I dislike nothing more in this ill Writer, than his perverse Adhering to his Paradoxes and Follies, notwithstanding all the Means that have, or can be used, to recover him to Truth and Soberness. My several Sheets I sent to him after I had heard the first Sermon he preach'd at Mr. Boyle's Lecture, he was pleased to answer no other-wise, than by a supercilious Disdain of all that I had done: That is, He printed that Sermon Word for Word, I think, as he preach'd it, and as I heard it, notwithstanding my long Letter to him; which yet contained a great Part of this Book I have now publish'd; as if in all those Sheets I had said just nothing.

This

This I resented not well, because it seemed a very unhandsome Affront to the Judgment of a Friend, who intended him kindness; and took no small Pains with him, that he might not rashly publish his Novelties and Absurdities to the World. This then shewed his intolerable Self-conceit, and Stiffness; and to name Particulars, which do clearly discover that Temper in him: Whether, for Instance, his Interpreting the Whole 8th *Psalms* to be a Prophecy of the *Messias*; and his making *Shear-jashub* to be the Child meant in the 15th and 16th Verses of the 7th Chapter of *Isaiah*; and his denying that *Hosea* 11. 1. hath any Connection with what goes before, and follows after in the Prophecy; and his Reprinting with Enlargement, that most Ridiculous Piece concerning *several Ascensions of Christ*: Whether, I say, these Things, and divers more of the same Sort, which the Reader may take notice of himself, and I need not here repeat, be not manifest Tokens of a very strange Obstinacy in Error, not to be liked or endured in any Man, much less becoming a Philosopher, let the World judge.

Indeed it hath been hinted to me by good Friends, That tho' the World may receive Benefit by my Labours, yet if I thought I should convince Mr. *Whiston* of any of his Errors, I might happen to find myself mistaken, and disappointed. As he writes

with

with a Conceit, and Heat, and Confidence, to which his Judgment and Reasonings bear not the least Proportion ; so he is as un-impressible as Steel, by all that can be said, to make him sensible how much he is in the Wrong ; and he seems resolv'd to be Proof against Evidence, and the strongest Arguments : The same Pride, which has produced his Novel Positions, sets him above all Conviction of the Errors of them, and he scorns the clearest Confutations of his Heresies.

But however, I hope I have done Good Service to the Truth, and that's my Comfort ; tho' peradventure no Good is likely to be wrought upon him, which is much to be pitied. But notwithstanding, if what I have done in this Work may serve to create abroad in the World so low an Opinion of the Man and his Performances, that the Loose Tracts he has written, or shall hereafter write, may not be able to do any harm, I shall gain my End in a great Measure.

Places of Scripture Explained
and Illustrated in the Pre-
face and Book.

GEnesis 3. 15. *And I will put enmity be-
tween thee and the woman, and be-
tween thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise
thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel,*
Page 132.

Numbers 24. 17. *I shall see him, but not
now; I shall behold him, but not nigh:
There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a
Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite
the corners of Moab, and destroy all the
children of Sheth,* p. 22.

Deuteron. 10. 8. *At that time the Lord se-
parated the Tribe of Levi, to bear the Ark
of the Covenant of the Lord;* Pref. p. 51.

2 Sam. 7. 15. *But my mercy shall not depart
away from Solomon, as I took it from Saul,
whom I put away before thee,* Book, p. 40.

Ib. V. 19. *And this was yet a small thing in
thy sight, O Lord GOD; but thou hast spe-*
ken

k
w
1 Ch
K
m
Psal
th
th
se
Ib. 8
lin
thi
nen
Ib. V
ven
and
Wh
and
p. 1
Ib. 21
thou
even
vati
upon
Ib. 78
I w
Ib. 118
fufec
p. 3
Ib. 72
God
son,

ken also of thy servant's house for a great while to come, p. 48.

1 Chron. 28. 7. Moreover I will establish his Kingdom for ever, if he be constant to do my Commandments, p. 50.

Psaln 2. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Why do the Hea-then rage, and the People imagine a vain thing? The Kings of the Earth set themselves, &c. p. 30.

Ib. 8. 2. Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength, because of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger, p. 33.

Ib. Verses 3, 4. When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained; What is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou visitest him? p. 103.

Ib. 21. 4, 5, 6. He asked life of thee, and thou gavest it him, even length of days for ever and ever; his glory is great in thy salvation; honour and majesty hast thou laid upon him, &c. p. 36.

Ib. 78. 2. I will open my mouth in a parable, I will utter dark sayings of old, p. 115.

Ib. 118. 22. The stone which the builders refused, is become the head-stone of the corner, p. 31.

Ib. 72. 1. Give the King thy Judgments, O God, and thy Righteousness unto the King's son, p. 55.

Isaiah 7. 14, 15, 16. *Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his Name Immanuel: Butter and honey shall he eat, &c. p. 69.*

Ib. 61. 1, 2. *The spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me, because the LORD hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek, &c. p. 88.*

Jeremiah 31. 3. *The Lord hath appeared of old unto me, saying, I have loved thee with an everlasting love, therefore with loving-kindness have I drawn thee, Pref. p. 24.*

Ib. v. 15. *Thus saith the Lord, A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping; Rachel weeping for her children, refused to be comforted for her Children, because they were not, Book, p. 121.*

Ezek. 1. 1. *Now it came to pass in the thirtieth Year, in the fourth month, in the fifth day of the month, &c. Pref. p. 57.*

Hosea 11. 1. *When Israel was a Child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt, Book, p. 90.*

Joel 1. 6. *For a Nation is come up upon my land, strong and without number, whose teeth are the teeth of a Lion, &c. Pref. p. 41.*

Ib. 2. 4, 5, &c. *The appearance of them as the appearance of horses, &c. ib.*

Malachi 1. 2, 3. *I have loved you, saith the Lord; yet ye say, wherein hast thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother, saith the*

the Lord? Yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage wast for the dragons of the wilderness,
p. 34.

Ib. 3. 6. *For I am the Lord, I change not : Therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed,*
p. 24.

Matthew 2. 23. *That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophets, he shall be called a Nazarene,* p. 64.

John 13. 18. *I speak not of you all : I know whom I have chosen : But that the Scripture may be fulfilled, he that eateth bread with me, hath lift up his heel against me,*
Book, p. 128.

Ib. 16. 16. *A little while, and ye shall not see me, and again a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father,* p. 230.

Ib. 20. 17. *Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father ; but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend to my Father, and your Father, to my God and your God,* p. 223.

Acts 1. 20. *For it is written in the Book of Psalms, Let his Habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein, and his Bishoprick let another take,* p. 129.

Romans 9. 10, 11, 12. *And not only this, but when Rebekah also had conceived by one, even by our Father Isaac ; (For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to*

election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth,) it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger, Pref. p. 29.

2 Tim. 3. 16. All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, for Instruction in Righteousness, Append. p. 294.

Hebrews 2. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. For unto Angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come: But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the Angels, &c. p. 97.

POST.

POSTSCRIPT.

A Little before this Table of Scriptures was Printed, Mr. *WHISTON*'s *Essay upon the Epistles of IGNATIUS* came to my Hands ; by which I see plainly that he is resolved still to Scribble on, and that the World shall have yet more of his wretched and pernicious Pieces : And I perceive likewise, that the more he writes, the more he grows Confident of his being Un-answerable. He fills and adorns several Margins of his *Essay* with Quotations ; he appeals to Copies, and Versions, and Citations, and Ancient Testimonies : And at first View one would be apt to think that he hath done mighty things. In short, his New Piece, as he conceives, is such Absolute Demonstration, that he *earnestly begs of all the Learned, that if they can Answer what he says about Ignatius's Epistles, they will immediately do it.*

P. 45.

For my Part, I cannot conveniently so far oblige him in his Request, as to examine and consider his *Essay* in a *Postscript* ; nor is there any need of doing it just now, since what I have already done in this Book may suffice for the present, and he will find enow of his Errors and Blunders here exposed to the World at one time.

B b 4

But

But it seems, together with his intreating in his *Essay*, that his Arguments might be immediately considered, he ventures in his Postscript *solemnly to Challenge*; and so he begs a speedy Answer, not without bidding Defiance to those of whom he asks it: For as for him, he is plentifully and strongly provided against all his Adversaries; and, as he says, he is *ready to produce above an Hundred plain Testimonies* for the Heresy he undertakes to defend, and is prepared to maintain his Point *beyond reasonable Contradiction*.

In this *Essay* he magnifies the Larger Epistles of *Ignatius*, believing them, for Reasons he produces, not to be *Interpolated*, but to be the *alone Genuine and Original Epistles of that Father*; and by that Faith is exceedingly confirm'd in the Belief of the Sacred and Divine Authority of the Apostolical Constitutions.

Indeed one would think it might be very sufficient to refer him to what the Learned Primate Archbishop *Usher* has written, upon the Larger Epistles ascribed to *Ignatius*, to prove those Epistles Spurious. As to the Objection about the *Valentinian* $\sigma\gamma\eta$, Bishop *Pearson* in his *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ* hath so fully Answered it, that certainly Mr. *Whiston* might have thought it worth the while to have given him the Reading over.

But this Piece is written in favour of *Arianism*, his New Persuasion, which is not,

as he there tells us, his *uncertain Opinion*,
but certain Faith. P. 47.

I was once, says he, in the Common Opin-
on, (not Faith) That the Father, Son, and
Holy Ghost, the Three Divine Persons, were
truly in some sense One God, or the One God of
the Christian Religion; that is, before I par-
ticularly examined that Matter in the Scri-
ptures, and the most Primitive Writers. I
also thought before my Examination, that the P. 48.
Doxology current in all these latter Ages,
Glory be to the Father, and to the
Son, and to the Holy Ghost, was the
true Christian Doxology: But upon Enquiry,
am fully satisfied that it was not so.

How Happy this Man is at Examining
Matters by Scripture and Antiquity, hath
been seen in great part already. One would
wonder indeed how from his Enquiries about
some Matters, there could arise the least Sa-
tisfaction to himself, that he Determines
right. Nevertheless he is forward to obtrude
his Discoveries upon others, as if his Argu-
ments were not only Cogent, but Convi-
ctive; whereas he may e'en as well stop
his Pen, and give over Publishing *Essays* in
Divinity: For he is much mistaken, if he
thinks his Scribbles can go down with the
Rational and Judicious Part of the World.

He *was once in the Common Opinion*, so he
calls the Faith of the Ever-Blessed Trinity.
Arrianism is now his *Certain*, and shall be
his *Constant Faith*, which he will persist in
un-

unalterably, so long as he is a Christian ; and if once he parts with it, why truly that and his Christian Faith are likely to go together. For *since I have thoroughly enquir'd, I am so fully satisfied that the Father alone is the One God of the Christian Religion, that I must now own, that when once I deny, or doubt of that Doctrine, I must deny, or doubt of, our Common Christianity.*

And why then does he beg an Answer to his *Essay*, as if it were possible to convince him of Errors in it, especially since it is so dangerous a thing to convince him, if it were possible ? For should he be press'd hard with forcible Arguments for the recovering him to that Orthodoxy, from which he has Apostatiz'd ; they that chance to shake his *Arrianism*, would endanger his Christianity too : And if we may believe what he says, the next thing in all likelihood we shall hear in that Case, is, his turning Jew, or Turk, or Pagan, or Deist, or Atheist. It's true, the Piece calls for an Antidote against the Poison of it ; but otherwise, out of mere Pity to the Man, one would rather let him alone ; for it is better he should continue *Arrian* still, than be Infidel altogether.

I say, he mightily recommends to the World *Ignatius's* Larger Epistles, and *Clement's* Constitutions : The Reason is, because he thinks those Books are for his purpose, and do furnish him with Arguments

ments for his Heresy. 'Tis not a little strange, says he, that the Critical Sagacity of these latter Ages has not discovered the mighty Antiquity both of Ignatius's Larger Epistles, and of the Apostolical Constitutions. Alas! for several Ages there has not been a Critick in Antiquity comparable to Mr. Whiston; none that deserves to be named with him. As it has been with the more Sacred Constitutions themselves, so also with these Sacred Epistles derived from them. Ignatius's Epistles are SACRED, Clement's Constitutions SACRED: Here is a Large Addition to the Canon of Scripture. God's time was not come for the discovery of his Primitive Truths, and the Preparation for the Advancement of his Son's Kingdom: Till which time, strong Delusions have prevail'd, and a Veil has been spread over the face of all Christian Nations, so that they could not see the most obvious and plain Truths in these Matters.

Mr. Whiston cannot forbear hinting to us, that he esteems himself a kind of Harbinger, or Fore-runner of the Happy Change and Revolution, which, he says, is to commence in 1716; and that whilst there is so hideous a Noise and Outcry against him, he is only executing his Preparatory Office: For he is rais'd up to take off the Veil that has been spread over the face of all Christian Nations; he is to retrieve the Primitive Exploded Truth, in Preparation for the Advancement of Christ's Kingdom; which, as

P. 10.

P. 38.

Essay on
the Revel.
p. 270,
271, 272.

he

he calculates, is then to begin. Vain Man! what will become of him!

- p. 46. All the while he takes it very ill, that his *Arrian* Positions are *enumerated among Passages of Blasphemy, Irreligion, and Heresy*; and he thinks it hard, That an *Honest*
- p. 48. *Man, who endeavours in the most inoffensive and peaceable way, to retrieve old genuine Christianity, if he ventures to speak plainly and freely in such Matters, is readily rank'd among the vile and wicked Promoters of Blasphemy, Irreligion, and Heresy among us. But if Men do not, I fully believe Christ will, make a difference between them at the Great Day of Judgment.*

I cannot but a little Animadvert upon these last Lines of his Postscript: What Notable Strokes are here! He says in the first Place, That he is an *Honest Man*. This he witnesseth of himself; and the truth is, in his Character Abroad he goes for a Person of Religion and Probity: But for all that, I do not find an Ingenuous Spirit in his Writings. In some things, as I have observed, he appears Unfair, as well as in others Injudicious; and want of Integrity is worse than weakness of Judgment. I think he does not deserve to be trusted, nor are any of his pretended Authorities, with which he makes an huge Shew and Clutter, to be relyed on without Examination: And truly, I am the more confirmed in my Opinion, that he is not so Sincere and Honest as he ought to be, because he

is a fetter forth of new and strange Doctrines.

If *Arrianism*, which he zealously defends under Colour of Zeal for Pure Antiquity; If, I say, his *Arrian* Hypothesis, as foul an Heresy as it is, were the only Error he would introduce into Christian Divinity, I should then be the more disposed to think him, what he tells us he is, *an Honest Man* notwithstanding; but divers new things he has obtruded on us of late, that indeed he is not an *Arrian* Heretick in particular, so much as an Heretick at large, I mean a Novelist. He loves not to be *in the Common Opinion*, he studies how to differ from the received and settled Doctrines of the Church; and therefore I vehemently suspect, that his wretched Affectation of Novelty has corrupted his Sincerity: And if that be the real Truth of the Case, May God open his Eyes, and discover it to him, and awaken him to a due Sense of his Insincerity, and give him Repentance, and forgive him.

Another of his Reasons, why he thinks he ought to be better used, than to be *rank'd among the vile and wicked Promoters of Blasphemy, Irreligion, and Heresy*, is his endeavouring to *retrieve old genuine Christianity in the most inoffensive way*; and yet at the same time he reproaches the Orthodox with an affected Ignorance of Antiquity, representing

sending them as Strangers to the Original Books of our Religion, because they either dare not look into them at all, or are Partial in their Enquiries.

p. 2. *The Moderns have been so affrighted, says he, with some ancient, but exploded Doctrines of Christianity, and Citations from the Constitutions of the Apostles (which have been themselves also exploded on the like Occasion) therein contained, that they have not had Courage or Impartiality enough, to enquire thoroughly into their Antiquity and Authority hitherto, as they ought to have done. And again,*

p. 48. *This Age is so great a Stranger to such Original Enquiries, (the Expression is wrong, his Meaning is, There are no Modern Enquiries into the Original State of the Christian Religion) so busy about Modern Forms, Notions and Phrases, that old genuine Christianity, both as to Faith and Practice, is almost lost among us.*

p. 46. *Thus contemptuously he reflects on all the Learned Divines of this Age, and so on the Learned Professors of that very University from which he dates his Essay: And this is endeavouring to retrieve old Christianity in the most inoffensive way; and he endeavours it in a most peaceable way too. This part of his Commendation of himself, I do not well understand, or like: The Peace of the Church is violated by Heresy, as well as by Schism: Now Mr. Whiston breaks*

breaks the Peace of the Church *in a most peaceable way* : What his Meaning is, I cannot easily guess, unless it be this, That no *Arrian* Mobb has yet appeared for him, and he would fain be in the New Fashion : However, let Men think or say of Mr. *Whiston* what they please, his Comfort is, that the Day of Judgment will do him Right : He, *Honest Man*, cannot endeavour to *re-trieve the old genuine Christianity*, without being *rank'd among the vile and wicked Promoters of Blasphemy, Irreligion, and Heresy* for his Pains ; But if Men do not, says he, *I fully believe Christ will, make a difference between them at the Great Day of Judgment.* Ay, and I must be very serious with Mr. *Whiston* too about a certain Matter, and must appeal likewise to the Day of Judgment, as he does. There is an Ingenuous and an Honest Zeal for the Truth, and there is an Incurable Pride and Obstinacy in Error : But if Mr. *Whiston* does not, I fully believe *Christ* will, make a difference between them at the Great Day of Judgment.

Seeing there hath happened an Occasion for a *Postscript*, I thought fit to subjoin one thing, which I omitted in my Book, *P. 297.* One ill Consequence of admitting any part of Scripture to be lost, as I observed there, is this ; That then for ought we know, a great Part of God's Book may be lost, yea, even

even as much of it as we now have. No, says Mr. *Whiston*, That cannot be : True it is indeed, that there have been Losses of Parts of Scripture, but *at the same time it appears by undoubted Evidence, that those Losses are few, and very rarely of any Books or Passages of great Consequence to us.* Now for a farther Check to his groundless Confidence in asserting, that such supposed Losses must be few, I might have added a Passage out of St. *Chrysostome*, which I quoted in the Margin of my Preface ; viz. Πολλὰ ἡ ἀληθινὰ βιβλία. For, as it seems, that did not appear *undoubtedly evident* to St. *Chrysostome*, which appears so to Mr. *Whiston*, though both are agreed that Losses of Scripture there have been. Mr. *Whiston* declares, it is *undoubtedly evident*, that they are *few* : St. *Chrysostome* on the contrary is positive, that they are *many*. Mr. *Whiston* doubts not to say, that *very rarely* have there been Scriptural Losses of Books of great Consequence to us ; but the Father tells us, that there have been divers Losses of Books of that Consequence to us ; for certainly περιηγητὰ βιβλία, Inspired Books of the Prophets, are such Important Books.

St. Edmund's-Bury,
April 11, 1710.



F I N I S.

No.
he it
of
he it
Lof-
s or
for
ence
hust
out
Mar-
that
to
Mr.
Lof-
Whi-
that
con-
Mr.
arely
ooks
ather
offes
; for
ooks
oks.